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**Meeting Purpose:**  
Building Vision Group

**Attendees:**  
Provost’s Office – Bryan Harvey, John Cunningham  
Admissions & Finance – Juanita Holler  
Physical Plant – Patrick Daly  
Facilities & Campus Planning – Jim Cahill, Susan Personette, Pam Rooney, Ludmilla Pavlova  
Burt Hill – Michael Reagan, Dave Linamen, Joel Nordberg

**Overview**  
1. This was a first meeting with an abbreviated Building Vision Group, primarily scheduled to review information about the buildings to the Study Team.  
2. The list of buildings in the study was distributed and reviewed. It was thought that Stockbridge should be added to the Academic study.  
3. Discussion took place around adding administration, advising, research affairs, English as a second language and other uses to the department program list. The discussion was taken off line. The Study Team will review and give Burt Hill an amended list.

**Data Gathering**  
4. The building rating system was distributed and briefly reviewed.  
5. The components of the architectural, plumbing/fire protection, HVAC and Electrical systems of a building are evaluated and rated with a score of 0 to 5, 0 being excellent condition (needing no immediate care) and 5 being very poor condition (needing the most care or total replacement).  
6. The component ratings are totaled and averaged by system and across a spread sheet for a total building score of 0 to 5 also.

**Buildings Condition Comments**  
The notes below are a summary of comments from the committee for the benefit of the consulting team.
7. Wilder
   a. A Legacy building.
   b. A new tile roof installation is in progress
   c. Electrical systems including fire alarm, have recently been upgraded.
   d. An asset worth further investment and revitalization.

8. Arnold
   a. The building is in fundamentally good condition and has received periodic upgrades and repairs.
   b. Arnold has vacant space and is one of a few buildings on campus for facilitating relocations and temporary moves during renovations.

9. Bartlett
   a. The building has experienced major façade failure on both the brick and wood curtain wall systems.
   b. The stabilization repairs were designed to hold for 10 years. Simpson Gumpertz does a 6 month inspection to check for advancing failure.
   c. A decision is required as to repairs and renovation of Bartlett or to consider it a bridge building in which case minimal investment would be made until in can be replaced.
   d. Emptying the building will be complicated due to the large number of departments that have space in the building
   e. The Bartlett auditorium is also a key instructional space that is fully scheduled from 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM.
   f. Bartlett will be a key planning element.
   g. Its viability will be a question of the projected cost to replace the façade and bring the rest of the systems up to acceptable standards.

10. Clark
    a. A legacy building.
    b. An asset worth further investment and reuse.
    c. The building is under utilized and the 3rd floor has been closed due to egress and life safety deficiencies. Users from HFA suggested that art, a gallery and perhaps art History would fit well into a renovated building.

11. Chapel
    a. An iconic building that has no program and will need significant work to become habitable.
    b. The building could be a premier event space and is a prime candidate for renovation.
    c. Not seen as a department building.
    d. Consideration might be given to a sub-grade connection to the Learning Common in the library.
    e. Role and level of attention in the Academic plan needs to be determined.
    f. The Chapel was last used by the Music department.

12. Dickinson
    a. A fundamentally sound building configured for medium size classroom use.
    b. The ground floor is air conditioned.
    c. The Campus Police will be moving out when their building is complete (2 years).
    d. Good, central location making this a key swing space building in the academic plan.

13. Draper
    a. A legacy building with multiple serious problems. Referred to as the least of the legacies.
    b. Concern that past floor overloading has caused the noticeable deflections in the floors.
    c. The basement is wet due to some combination of foundation drainage and roof leader failures.
    d. The roof and flashings are in bad repair and the complexity of the roof shapes makes repairs very costly.
    e. There is a police emergency command center in the building that will move with the new public safety building about to be built.
f. Handicap access was noted to be very difficult to resolve.
g. The building is on a very desirable, central building site.
h. There is strong feeling that no investment should be made in the building and that it should be razed as space comes available to move the occupants out.
i. The SBS Dean’s office likes being in the building.

14. Fine Arts Center  
   a. The building is central to arts programs and needs to be brought up to and maintained to standard.
   b. The bridge needs to be reprogrammed to better utilize space made available by program that moved to the Studio Arts Building.
   c. Relocating landscape architecture into the building would be desirable if adequate space is available.
   d. There is an HVAC upgrade of the theater underway.
   e. The building has significant deficiencies in ADA, ventilation, etc.

15. Flint  
   a. A legacy building from the original agricultural college.
   b. In poor condition with problematic access, HVAC, ground water, air quality and noted structural reinforcing in the basement.
   c. The group questionable reuse potential of the building.

16. Furcolo  
   a. Program division between School of Education departments currently split between Furcolo and Hills is a primary concern. The location at the extreme north edge of the campus is difficult for students and faculty.
   b. A decision from the town on whether to keep Marks Meadow active could influence planning. A town vote is scheduled for 5/19/09.
   c. Arnold may be and alternative location for EPRA and SDPPS from Hills.
   d. The Montague house next door was also mentioned as a potential asset.

17. Goodell  
   a. A legacy building as the first dedicated library building on campus.
   b. There is space available in the area of the removed stacks but a recent study indicates that the renovation costs will be high.
   c. A $1.5 mil. sprinkler installation project has recently been completed.
   d. The group concurred that Goodell is a good candidate for investment.

18. Alfond & Isenberg  
   a. Key buildings, program and site.
   b. Highly used space in generally good condition.
   c. Alfond needs to be kept at its current high quality level and investment in Isenberg to bring it up is desirable.

19. Hampshire House  
   a. A building that should not be invested in.
   b. The buildings primary academic function is in housing graduate student offices and is not a good location relative to their departments.

20. Herter  
   a. A key, heavily used, work horse building.
   b. The basement of the annex (Translation Center and Communications Studio) has air quality issues.
   c. Improvements should be made to make the north entrance to the basement more useable.
   d. The auditoria are very heavily used.
   e. Recent investment has been made in the ventilation, air conditioning (2 new chillers) and plaza water proofing systems. Windows have also been replaced.
f. Continued investment to sustain and improve Herter is a priority.
g. The Department kitchenettes are in poor condition and are undersized.

21. Machmer
   a. Machmer is very heavily used but in generally poor condition with only basic accessibility to one level.
   b. The entrance steps are deteriorating.
   c. Recent investment has gone into the roof, flooring and abatement.
   d. Machmer is a key focus of the study.

22. Mahar
   a. The key (and largest) auditorium on campus.
   b. Mahar is fully scheduled.
   c. Significant investment has been made in HVAC and finishes.
   d. Mahar needs to be kept up and investment may need to be accelerated by heavy use.

23. Middlesex House
   a. A building that should not be invested in. It is in poor condition and has no HVAC.
   b. Psychology should be relocated.

24. New Africa House
   a. Seen as a keeper.
   b. A new slate roof has been installed.
   c. A project is about to begin to install an elevator, handicap toilets and fire alarm.
   d. A commitment to invest in New Africa House has been made.

25. South College
   a. The building is in generally poor condition and has no handicap accessibility.
   b. The third floor has been closed due to life safety, egress problems and to reduce occupancy loads.
   c. The floor plate is not well shaped for reuse.
   d. There are strong sentiments that no investment should be made in South College.
   e. The site is highly desirable and seen as a development site for a future new building.

26. Stockbridge
   a. A legacy building of the original agricultural college.
   b. A fire protection project is planned.
   c. Continued investment is warranted.
   d. Bowker Auditorium is an active performance facility.
   e. Basement space will become available with the relocation of some science programs.

27. Thompson
   a. A solid building with accessibility problems.
   b. Recent investment has been made in a new chiller.
   c. Planning needs to be in place to bring Thompson up in deficient areas and keep it up.
   d. Floor plates are tight, corridors narrow, limited department gathering space.

28. Tobin
   a. Psychology headquarters.
   b. Significant investment has been made in recent years to reinforce structure, redo plaza waterproofing, replace the chiller and cooling tower.
   c. Studies were done to look at adding a penthouse and enclosing the colonnade levels.
   d. A commitment to invest and keep the building up has been made and will continue.

29. Totman
   a. Science (Kinesiology) is the primary occupant. The building plays only a small role in the “academic” study, housing dance and 2 UMass Classrooms.
b. Gymnasium space will become available in the fall when the recreation building comes on line.
c. The gym space is heavily used during exam times as it can be set up with space between seats.
d. There is a problem with the pool which cannot be put off indefinitely.

30. Library
   a. A Chapter 34 code review was recently done.
   b. A space utilization study is needed. UMass will provide a scope which will include a review of the whole library system.
   c. An $8 mil. project is underway to upgrade Electrical and HVAC systems.

Scheduling
31. Next meeting will be April 16.
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Subject/Project Number: Building Vision Group

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number:  Meeting Date:  Project Phase:  Meeting Location:
2 4/16/2009 1:00 Information Gathering ST02 UMass Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Building Vision Group review of rating standards & condition groups

Attendees:  
DCAM:  Sarah Tindall
UMass:  Susan Personette (SP), Pam Rooney (PR), Ludmilla Pavlova (LP) – F&CP
Patrick Daly (PD), Dan McCarty - Physical Plant
Juanita Holler – Administration & Finance
Brian Harvey - Provost’s Office
Burt Hill:  Dave Linamen, Joel Nordberg, Jeff Funovits,
Janeen Jaworski, Michael Reagan, Steven Brittan

Comments:  Handouts of the power point presentation and the ranking spread sheet were distributed at the meeting and have been posted to the UMass ShareSite, Document Library, Burt Hill, Presentations.

Introduction & Overview
1. JN reviewed Burt Hill’s summary of the evaluation of the buildings that fall within the project’s scope. JN noted the evaluation analysis is not strictly numerical and has tried to take into account recent systems upgrades and special considerations such as Legacy Buildings.
2. LP proposed that accessibility should possibly be considered as a separate category from circulation. JN noted.

Findings & Building Reviews
3. Buildings were presented and reviewed according to the condition groups identified on the spreadsheet handout (High standard/Continue Aggressive Maintenance; Capital Improvement Program; Candidates for Extensive Rehabilitation; Legacy Extensive Rehabilitation; and, Remove from Inventory).
4. BH asked if Burt Hill has developed a conclusion about Goodell. JN noted that upgrades to Goodell could be done over time as a series of capital improvement projects or in a more comprehensive renovation while the building was taken off line, depending on programmatic conclusions not yet reached.

5. JH inquired about structural analysis. JN noted that only known deficiencies have been recorded at this time and that a targeted review will take place by the structural engineer before the next meeting.

6. JH suggested including a classroom count and classroom seat count on building description “bubbles”. Also, square foot (sf) should be clarified as gross square feet (GSF).

7. It was agreed that building sentiment should be captured in the Building Analysis. For instance, Afro-American Studies expressed interest in remaining in New Africa House due to its history.

8. Regarding sustainability, it was agreed that a sustainability committee would be established to discuss strategies for sustainability.

9. Plaza pavers at the Fine Arts Center are currently a problem due to breakage when the support pedestals become out of level.

10. JH asked about egress capacity and egress problems. JN noted that problems observed such as dead-end corridors, stairs and corridor obstructions have been recorded. A more detailed study of the short-listed buildings will be completed to consider egress loads and any variance from compliance with current codes.

11. Regarding Goodell, BH noted a recommendation could be made for intermediate steps to upgrade it.

12. Regarding Dickinson, this building could be used as swing space since it will be vacated around the time the new building will break ground.

13. DL reviewed a retrofit HVAC system that Burt Hill has used successfully on other old buildings.

14. Regarding Clark and Wilder, a chilled water supply and return line exists between the Integrated Science Building and the new Studio Arts Building that might be tapped into.

15. Bartlett is most likely a good candidate for a closer look at the feasibility of rehabilitation. LP felt that following the relocation of the occupants in Hills and its subsequent demolition, upgrades, renovations or demolition of Bartlett would be next on the list.

16. Machmer will be one of the buildings that will be getting some repair work in the near term such as roof work, front entry stairs, and unit ventilator replacement. Concern was raised over the return on investment in Machmer.

17. No general disagreement was noted over the categorization of the building thus far.

Next Steps

18. Continue to develop the criteria for building candidates for major renovation.

19. Identify short list of the four buildings that, by their extensive renovation, best support the academic plan for further consideration in the solutions phase.

20. Develop a strategy for developing and or taking out of inventory the Legacy Buildings that are in poor condition. Coordinate with Form B, Massachusetts Historical Commission documentation that is currently ongoing.

21. Begin order of magnitude cost estimating for levels of renovation.

22. Next meeting – targeting May 13 or 14.
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Subject/Project Number: Building Vision Group

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 3  Meeting Date: 5/14/2009
Meeting Date: 5/14/2009
Meeting Time: 10:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
ST02
Meeting Location: UMass Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:

Building Vision Group Review of Impact of Perspective Renovation or Demolition Considerations on Programmed Space

Attendees: Distribution:
DCAM: Ann Storer
Ann Storer, Susan Personette (SP), Pam Rooney (PR),
Pam Rooney, Ludmilla Pavlova (LP) – F&CP
Ludmilla Pavlova (LP), Patrick Daly (PD), Dan McCarty - Physical Plant
Patrick Daly (PD), Dan McCarty - Physical Plant
Juanita Holler (JH) – Administration & Finance
Juanita Holler (JH) – Administration & Finance
Brian Harvey (BH), John Cunningham - Provost’s Office
Brian Harvey (BH), John Cunningham - Provost’s Office
Burt Hill: Janeen Jaworski, Michael Reagan, Steven
Janeen Jaworski, Michael Reagan, Steven
Brittan, Benjamin Kou, Joel Nordberg, Alex
Benjamin Kou, Joel Nordberg, Alex
Wing, Emily Santilli
Emily Santilli

Comments: Handouts of the power point presentation and the ranking spread sheet were distributed at the meeting and have been posted to the UMass ShareSite.

The focus of the meeting was to take an early look at the impact on programs and departments of taking certain buildings off line for renovation and/or demolition. Discussion was limited to buildings in the “Demolish, Preserve and Redo” categorizes, however similar information on all the buildings in the study is contained in the handout.

The ranking system of the buildings was briefly reviewed. The buildings were introduced according to their condition/ranking and slides were presented containing charts indicating occupancy, overall net square footage, the percent of the overall net area by department and the number of UMass Classrooms in each building.
Demolish

1. **Hills**: It was agreed Hills should be demolished.
   1.1. AS suggested relocating SOE to Arnold. AS asked if science space may be freed up for uses like Anthropology. AS also asked if classrooms in Tobin can be relocated to allow Psych to expand. AS also suggested relocating people out of Herter to allow LLC to consolidate.

2. **Middlesex**: No disagreement was noted that Middlesex should be demolished, however there does not appear to be the same urgency to take the building off line at there is with Hills. Planning will proceed under the assumption that the program space in Middlesex will have to be moved.

3. **Hampshire**: Ditto Middlesex. It was also noted that Berkshire, which is not in the Burt Hill study should eventually come off line as well.

Preserve

4. **South College**: Planning will proceed under the assumption that programs and departments will have to be relocated due to the extent of the renovations required or the eventual demolition, should that prove to be feasible.

5. **Draper**:
   5.1. AS asked if goal is to vacate Draper in 10 years. BH noted funds are not allocated for renovations to Draper in the short term so it will need to stay occupied for now. SP noted Draper needs to be preserved as a legacy building.
   5.2. It was agreed that an estimate of Draper renovation costs will be developed. Planning will proceed under the assumption that programs and departments will have to be relocated due to the extent of renovation required or eventual demolition, should that prove to be feasible.

6. **Flint**:
   6.1. AS noted Hospitality Management currently in Flint would ideally be located in an addition to ISOM.
   6.2. It was agreed Flint could be used as a classroom building for smaller room sizes.
   6.3. Planning will proceed under the assumption that programs and departments will have to be relocated due to the extent of renovation required.

7. **Machmer**:
   7.1. Juanita noted Machmer’s site may be more valuable than the value of the current building.
   7.2. AS noted Anthropology will require relocation to renovated space. AS suggested moving Anthropology to Fernald.
   7.3. AS noted UMass direction will be need to be provided regarding the future of Machmer to allow campus master planning to begin.
   7.4. Planning will proceed under the assumption that programs and departments will have to be relocated at some point due to the extent of renovation required or eventual demolition, should that prove to be more feasible.

8. **Stockbridge**:
   8.1. All agreed Stockbridge should be maintained.
   8.1.1. Fire protection is currently being installed in a portion of the building.
   8.1.2. AS noted we will need UMass input for future use based on Wilson Architects planning.
   8.1.3. NRE has indicated they would be happy to move or stay.
   8.2. Stockbridge is in a condition that could allow its classification to be changed to “catch-up” as it may be feasible to make upgrades in capital improvement phases without the need to take the building off-line to bring it up to a higher standard of space.

9. **Clark**
   9.1. Clark is currently underutilized. Science will be vacating and Clark will be even more underutilized.
   9.1.1. AS suggested establishing a future Arts building on Lot 62 to reinforce an Arts District.
   9.1.2. BH suggested using Clark for landscape Architecture.
   9.1.3. Juanita agreed potential use should take advantage of natural light available in Clark.
9.1.4. AS suggested Morrill 3 could be used for Landscape Architecture.

9.2. When the science programming is relocated there will be a relatively small amount of Art and Fine Art Center space remaining in Clark.

9.3. Planning will proceed under the assumption that this remaining program space will have to be relocated at some point due to the extent of renovation required.

10. Bartlett:
10.1. BH suggested eliminating Bartlett auditorium 65.
10.2. Juanita requested breaking out separate data for each wing of Bartlett to allow consideration of partial building demolition or phase renovations.
10.3. AS suggested combining English into the remaining wing. It was agreed that placing offices in the classroom wing may be an inefficient solution.
10.4. AS asked if demo of the north wing of Bartlett were done, could Bartlett 65 be rebuilt into the hillside or would it have to be removed? Burt Hill will consider.
10.5. Planning will proceed considering the extensive study done by Symmes Maini & McKee, the cost of renovations versus new construction, the time factor of renovations versus new construction and that programs and departments will have to be relocated at some point due to the extent of renovation required or eventual demolition, should that prove to be more feasible.

11. Chapel:
11.1. Should be considered separately, however, identifying a good use or program fit for the building will be key to its renovation.
11.2. The building is currently vacant.

12. Wilder:
12.1. Wilder is currently getting a new tile roof.
12.2. Planning will proceed under the assumption that programs and departments will have to be relocated at some point due to the extent of renovation required.

Catch-Up

13. School of Management:
13.1. Moderate renovation are required such as window replacement and HVAC upgrades.
13.2. Planning will proceed under the assumption that improvements can be made without taking the building offline.

14. Fine Arts Center:
14.1. Modest renovations are required.
14.2. BH noted additions may be an appropriate solution to solving space needs for music and theater. Perhaps as a short term solution, trailers could be used.
14.3. AS noted Theater needs a sprung floor as does dance. AS suggested creating shared space that could function as ensemble space, as well as theater and dance space? BH agreed, music and dance need more space.
14.4. BH noted a decision on the art bridge and architectural studio type spaces being used by programs that could be in more standard art classroom type space.
14.4.1. BH suggested using a portion of Art Bridge for Landscape Architecture.
14.4.2. BH suggested that a side study is needed for Art Bridge use.
14.4.3. BH noted current studios are not heavily used by architecture and perhaps a better use of the space could be determined.
14.5. Planning will proceed under the assumption that improvements can be made without taking the building offline.

15. Goodell:
15.1. Library stack space is not used and basement space is also available.
15.2. BH suggested using Goodell for student services like advising and take advantage of central location.
15.3. AS noted Commonwealth College needs extra space and Commonwealth College has suggested moving into Dickinson. BH noted many full time lecturers have been hired by Commonwealth College and now space is needed for these offices. BH noted that the status of Commonwealth College and their needs need to be discussed by administration. It was noted that every student has one or more major and Commonwealth College works as an advising center rather than a department home.

15.4. Juanita noted several studies have been completed to renovate stack space.

15.5. BH noted that Goodell is one of only a few opportunities in central campus that could yield additional space. BH noted that Goodell could strategically have many benefits if renovated in the first phase of the Comprehensive Plan.

15.5.1. AS asked if Library should not be first phase of a multi phase renovation.

15.5.2. BH noted the reported price of Library renovations may make it more expensive than it would be worth.

16. Next Steps:

16.1. The “tracks” for building, site, department and classrooms considerations will start to merge as the Information Gathering phase begins to wrap up and the focus shifts to planning.

16.2. The building information needs to get wrapped into a report format.

16.3. Burt Hill will begin to engage the cost estimating consultant and start to establish renovation benchmarks.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Classroom Vision Group Prep-Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Academic Classroom Facilities  
University of Massachusetts – Amherst  
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1  
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Meeting Location: Facilities Building |

## Meeting Purpose:

Pre-meeting for Classroom Vision Group

## Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| UMass F&CP, Jim Cahill, Bryan Harvey, Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova  
DCAM, Ann Storer  
Burt Hill, Alex Wing, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg  
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Susan Personette, Michael Reagan, Alex Wing |

The purpose of this meeting was to identify the key points and issues for Burt Hill to present to the Classroom Vision group for their discussion. Current work on the classroom utilization study was identified.

1. A “down-load” session from the University for their thoughts on classrooms, buildings, facilities (conditions), etc should be scheduled soon and include Michael Reagan.

2. Classroom Vision group is being identified by the University and will be comprised of Associate Deans, Pam Rooney, and the Registrar. Deans will be notified and given the option to attend.

3. Alex Wing identified that there appear to be classroom needs outside of the current inventory, such as spaces scheduled outside of the registrar. Brian Harvey identified that courses bearing credit are the key. Almost all credit-bearing courses should be scheduled in rooms via the registrar in order to have a room reserved. There may be a small component of courses that bear credit and do not have scheduled space through the registrar that most likely needs to be captured in this study.

4. Charmilla schedules spaces for all credit-bearing activities, as well as the Opportunistic Uses. Charmilla also has a list of all credit bearing activity. Fall schedule data from Charmilla (credit and room assignment info) will be given to Burt Hill for review in order to identify outlying credit courses. This data should include exam schedules. Once the outliers are identified, Burt Hill can asked pointed questions to the departments.

5. Categories of Space Use: 1) Scheduled, credit bearing. 2) Independent study – no space expectation, some portion of which is mixed, tutorial, teaching space. 3) Mixed Use – eg. conference rooms partially scheduled as seminars. 4) Non-credit bearing special events, exams, colloquium, etc (Opportunistic Use).

6. Exam schedules are an ongoing scheduling challenge. Exams must be put into larger than normal rooms to allow open seats between students. The amount of space available changes how exams are scheduled. Large rooms are utilized for other purposes in non-exam periods, such as study sessions, performances, lectures, student activities, rehearsals, films, etc.
7. A growth in instruction (enrollment) means more exam seats needed, which pushes the Opportunistic Uses into steep competition.

8. The importance of department specific space generating department identity was discussed. This item will become part of the department right-sizing process.

9. Department assigned space is crucial to high utilization and limited load on registrar’s office. The departments can schedule their own space more effectively than with strict registrar oversight. Instruction space may be better assigned to the registrar for better tracking.

10. UMass classroom room capacities are currently based on occupancies developed from building code, square footage per occupant criteria. This amount of seats leads most rooms to over-filled and should have a row removed to clear access to teaching walls and/or improve sight lines. Following this argument, roughly 10% of seats in all classrooms need to be removed to make good instructional spaces. Refitting the rooms with tablet arm chairs to tables and chairs would reduce the seat counts by roughly 25%. Most rooms have one instructional wall, though two is desired in most cases. The previous needs to be confirmed with pedagogy taken into account. Jim Cahill identified that if we right size the classrooms (by removing a percentage of the seats), we may find that when more classrooms are built, few or no new seats will be gained. Alex Wing suggested the plan identify the ideal and then recognize that it must be realistically approached.

11. Many of the auditoria spaces have been identified as worn out and/or not accessible. Upgrades to auditoria have been minimal (seat recovering only) due to limited time over the summer to renovate. Classrooms are simpler to upgrade because they can be done faster with less code implications. Auditoria cannot be taken off line during the school year due to the current over-utilization. Swing space would be necessary, which is something to consider for the new building.

12. There are three things to consider when evaluating and right-sizing the classrooms: 1) Condition/Configuration (lose from inventory), 2) Pedagogy (may change classroom set up and capacity, eg tables and chairs), 3) Sustainability (can room bear up to intensity of use), and 4) Program Identity (institutional development potential).

13. Repairing the auditoria portion is key since Brian Harvey identified that 50% of all instruction takes place in that space type. Mahar alone provides a venue for 10% of all instruction.

14. A fundamental infrastructure problem exists with the space that is available on campus and its condition. Brian Harvey would like to build their way out of the problem. The remaining question is how to prioritize the spaces and develop a renewal schedule to plan for the future.

15. The university needs to find a measurement of how much alternative seating is needed to accommodate appropriate space for changing needs in instructional interaction. Brian Harvey posed the questions of how to define right-sizing, and what is the right/practical mix of spaces moving forward.

16. Currently, the inventory of spaces is driving the schedule and pedagogy. Alex Wing would like to develop a model for what the infrastructure should be, which would allow pedagogy to be the driver. A model for how much time a student spends in different types of spaces was proposed. Students generally do not get into smaller class settings until their 3rd year. This model would lead to another large (Mahar scale) auditoria, but this is a facilities driven model. A pedagogically driven model should also be looked at to understand how much space would be needed to accommodate a new “Public University” model (retaining large classes in early years, attain smaller class sections earlier than 3rd year). UMass does not compete with small, private institutions and sees the need to get competitive with other large public universities.

17. Budget cuts will reduce Graduate Student TAs by roughly 200. The current trend at UMass is moving toward more students and less faculty.

18. Count of room distribution by size (bar chart) is to be charted, as well as distribution of classroom seats by size/population (line chart). Current charts should be matched against Brian Harvey’s study from a few years ago.

19. Monday, Wednesday and Friday courses tend to (want to) schedule large lectures Monday & Wednesday with sessions/seminars on Friday, which alters the classroom availability factor, densifying auditoria use on Monday and Wednesday and leaving them empty on Friday. The scheduling has been modified for next semester to prevent this.
20. Asynchronous Activities (credit bearing but not in a regular class schedule) seminars, two week intensives, off-site learning, on-line learning, etc. does not affect the inventory. Most intensives happen through continuing education. On line learning will most likely be program driven in the future and is a continuing discussion that also does not affect the inventory. Any other asynchronous activities are considered under opportunistic use.

21. Previous questionnaires have been conducted by the University. Brian Harvey will give these documents to Ludmilla Pavlova, who will post them onto the Sharepoint for Burt Hill. The current classroom questionnaire design will continue to be developed by the classroom vision group.

22. Current distinctions between classroom, seminar, and lecture use types cannot be easily confirmed by facilities. Burt Hill will develop room types by size for analysis and will continue the conversation with the classroom vision group.

23. 92 seat classroom is planned for 220 Morrill Sci Ctr II January 2010.

24. Bryan Harvey identified that a great deal of the planning hinges on key components such as whether or not Hills is removed from the inventory. Other campus issues will significantly drive the new building. Brian Harvey said that the university needs to identify (sooner rather than later) what is driving the new building: current inventory/facilities, moving out of Hills, moving out of South College, Music School expansion, etc.

25. With this study, Alex Wing identified that a good room set should be establish prior to distribution questions, and then question about how space is scheduled.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Number</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
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Meeting Purpose:
The purpose of this meeting was to define the Utilization project to the Classroom Vision Group and begin a general discussion about learning environments at UMass Amherst.

Attendees:
UMass F&CP: Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM: Ann Storer
UMass Groups:
- Provost: Bryan Harvey, Richard Rogers, John Cunningham
- Registrar: John Lenzi, Sharmilla Murtha
- Faculty Senate: Ernie May
- Commonwealth College: Cory Pols, Priscilla Clarkson
- Engineering: Bernie Schliemann, Jim Rinderle
- ISOM: Jay Gladden
- SBS: Karen Schoenberger
- NRE: Martha Baker, Patti Corach
- HFA: Ronald Michaud
Burt Hill: Alex Wing, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg, Michael Regan

Distribution:
Ann Storer
Ludmilla Pavlova
Susan Personette
Michael Reagan
Alex Wing
Emily Santilli
Joel Nordberg

Comments:

Overview:
Burt Hill presented to the Classroom Vision Group about the ongoing Classroom Utilization study. Terms, process, and initial findings were shown. Burt Hill presented a draft of the Learning Environment questionnaire for the faculty/staff for discussion and comment.

- Data Gathering
  1. The Learning Environment survey was distributed to the group for comment. Burt Hill will provide the final iteration for Faculty to complete prior to the next Classroom Vision group meeting.
2. The group asked if exams and exam scheduling could be added to the questionnaire. There are constraints on equipment, room size, test formats that can be given in current facilities, etc.

3. The concept of a potential new testing facility was raised. (See “Other”)

4. Bryan Harvey identified that the room size faculty currently request is distorted by the available inventory. Suggestions were made to be more specific when asking the faculty about desired room sizes.

5. When asking in the questionnaire about what classes are taught, the group suggested adding class/room size here as well.

6. Class size and duration are to be clarified for the questionnaire because some classes are taught in sections.

7. The group asked for the questionnaire to expand upon the satisfaction questions. Satisfaction of availability of classrooms by time of week, time of day, and non-standard time lengths should be captured.

8. The group would like the questionnaire to ask if the departments want more control over their own spaces.

9. A student survey is also to be developed. The group decided that the student’s voice will be important, especially since they are the “consumer.” Bryan Harvey identified that the students have not yet been polled for that sort of thing.

10. Bryan Harvey has been preparing documents that show enrollment and space use shifts over time, which he will provide to Burt Hill.

- **Scheduling**

11. Sharmilla identified that she has schedule information for such things as tutorials that may not show in the registrar’s database. Sharmilla will communicate this information to Burt Hill.

12. Burt Hill has not yet received the exam/night schedule for the auditoriums, etc. The study needs to show that the rooms are scheduled even though the scheduled items do not show in the registrar’s database.

13. Burt Hill would like to understand some of the dependency issues across departments and courses as it pertains to schedule.

14. Ron Michaud raised the concept of culture change in terms of scheduling. He notices teachers wanting 2-day teaching weeks and students and faculty wanting long weekends. The current culture reflects entitlement to time off. The group discussed the challenges of changing the culture.

15. Evenings are typically reserved for exams and other evening/asynchronous activities that are scheduled by the Sharmilla. Courses that are typically taught in the evening suffer from student absence when exam and class schedules conflict. Though the current schedule shows empty rooms in the evening, the exam schedule has not yet been applied.

- **Pedagogy**

16. Alex Wing identified that pedagogy will be discussed in future meetings of this group. Pedagogy will play an important role in defining the right room types within the ideal learning environment set.

- **Existing Conditions**

17. Through Burt Hill’s presentation, the existing conditions were discussed. Alex wing identified how Burt Hill is looking at the existing conditions in order to analyze the learning environment use.
• Analysis

18. The group concluded that the Utilization Analysis is not just about spaces: it’s about time. That is why the room list within Burt Hill’s scope is very important to quantify against the current schedules.

19. The current practice at UMass Amherst is to maximize the classrooms – not optimize them. Through the forthcoming analysis, the group will move toward optimization for future planning.

20. Burt Hill presented some learning environment types that demonstrate trends in education. The push Burt Hill sees is toward tables and chairs from the more traditional tablet arm chairs. Burt Hill will provide the room types presentation (attached) to the group for further internal discussion over the coming weeks.

21. Susan Personette asked the group to open their minds about what is possible – to dream somewhat – and figure out where the University wants to go in the long term. She identified that the Classroom Vision group will be able to help shape/define that change.

• Findings and Recommendations

22. No discussion

• Other

23. A 500 seat Testing Center was discussed. Previous studies have tried to locate this center in the Library Learning Commons. 500 seats is ideal for a Mahar-sized class (largest on campus). The Library has considered dedicating a floor within the Library for testing, which would return roughly 250 seats. Penn State’s model was identified as a good example of this. UMass has considered getting into the private testing arena with an on campus testing center (Prometrics-style).

• Next Steps

24. Burt Hill will develop a draft student questionnaire for Monday, April 20th for comment prior to the next Classroom Vision group meeting.

25. UMass will return comments on the classroom questionnaire for further development by Burt Hill.

Action Items

• Sharmilla to provide exam schedule and schedule of asynchronous activities (remainder from previous meeting)
• Sharmilla will provide schedule information on tutorials if it does not appear in registrar’s schedule
• Burt Hill will add questions to classroom questionnaire as identified above and distribute for completion
• Burt Hill to prepare draft of student questionnaire for Monday, April 20th for UMass comment
• Bryan Harvey will send enrollment and space use shifts over time to Burt Hill
• Burt Hill to provide room types presentation for discussion/comment. To be revisited at next meeting

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,
BURT HILL
/s/
Emily Santilli
April 13, 2009 (revised to incorporate edits by Ann Storer, 12/22/09 – Joel Nordberg)
MEETING MINUTES

From: Emily Santilli  May 10, 2009 (revised 12/22/09)

Subject/Project Number: Classroom Vision Group

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2  Meeting Date: 05/04/2009
10:30am – 12:00pm  Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Facilities Building

Meeting Purpose:
The purpose of this meeting was to further identify and discuss the key points and issues of the Learning Environment Utilization study including existing inventory analysis and preliminary findings.

Attendees: Distribution:
Umass Admin: Juanita Holler, Bryan Harvey  Ann Storer, Ludmilla
Facilities Planning: Jim Cahill, Cleve Carrens  Pavlova, Alex Wing,
Campus Planning: Susan Personette, Andy Soles, Lu  Michael Reagan
Pavlova
Physical Plant: Pat Daly
Burt,Hill: Joel Nordberg, Michael Reagan, Jeff
Funovits
DCAM: Ann Storer

Comments: The Power Point presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.

Overview:
Burt Hill identified continued progress as well as preliminary findings for the Learning Environment Utilization Study. General Use Learning Environments and Specialized Learning Environments were established and discussed. Utilization trends have begun to emerge.

Data Gathering

1. Burt Hill identified that the two informational databases (Registrar’s Fall 2008 Schedule and Facilities’ Horizon Room Data) have been merged. Utilization analysis has begun to be run on this combined data.

2. The Faculty Questionnaire is now closed and trends are being developed. Less than 14% of the potential respondents answered the questionnaire, so statistical analysis is limited. (Post Meeting Note: of the 331 who responded, 238 (72% of respondents) are Deans, Dept Heads, Tenured, and non Tenured Faculty/Lecturers. The remainders are Grad TAs, Staff, and those identifying themselves as Other.)
3. 20 rooms were identified as managed by the Registrar (UMass Classrooms) in the Horizon data, but remain unscheduled. The attendees provided Burt Hill with preliminary information about these rooms, many of which appear to be assigned to departments or under renovation.

4. Specialized Learning Environments represents 332 or 42.5% of the total 780 rooms being reviewed in this study. Burt Hill cannot find consistent or complete schedule data for all of these spaces, therefore, standard utilization analysis cannot be run on these spaces. Burt Hill is developing a model to analyze these spaces.

5. Though only General Use Learning Environments (257) are being run through the utilization analysis at this point, the remaining rooms will be looked at and understood in broader and different terms. Some of the remainder will be found to be an integral part of the General Use set and be added to it following further investigation.

6. Burt Hill will provide a list of Specialized Learning environments (including Computer Classrooms and Computer Labs) for the departments to briefly review. Items that are miscoded should be identified to Burt Hill as soon as possible.

- **Scheduling**

7. Total number of courses at UMass in Fall 2008 was above 7,000. Only roughly 2,800 of these courses have room assignment information in the scheduling data. Burt Hill has begun to run brief schedule analysis in order to identify and group courses that could/should have room assignment information to understand the impact that the course is probably having on the inventory. Courses without room designations are probably having an impact on the inventory, but that impact has not been catalogued.

8. Ann Storer said that many departments have identified difficulty scheduling events, specifically during the regular “school day” (roughly 8am – 5pm, schedule blocks)

9. Exam scheduling was discussed. Scheduling exams in the evening conflicts with evening courses and student miss regularly scheduled courses in the evening for exams.

10. A need for more headroom, especially in lecture spaces, was discussed. This headroom would allow for more schedule flexibility.

- **Pedagogy**

11. Not discussed.

- **Existing Conditions**

12. The difference between a “Classroom” space and a “Lecture” space (as identified in the Horizon data) was identified as follows: Classrooms have flat floors; Lecture spaces have tiered or sloped floors.

13. UMass identified that the number of faculty will be decreasing, so the faculty will have to be more efficient in teaching over the coming semesters.

14. In the fall semester, testing will be transitioning to an every-seat arrangement, as well as having exams during class periods, in order to help meet space and scheduling challenges. From a pedagogical standpoint, this is not ideal since the environment cannot be as strictly controlled and the quality of testing will be reduced (heightened chance of cheating).

15. Some buildings have been identified as having better maintenance than others. Possible factors are better maintenance crews, classrooms that are more highly scheduled, and buildings that serve the population 9am-9pm instead of 9am-5pm. Burt Hill will further evaluate the Learning Environments and their intensity of use.
• Analysis

16. Of the scheduled courses that have no room assignment information, 14% are probably in Learning Environments but are not being scheduled or tracked by the registrar, and most likely are not occurring in UMass Classrooms.

17. When a room is occupied, the seat fills are within acceptable ranges. This will change when ADA and pedagogical changes potentially reduce the seat count in each room. Though the seat fill is within an acceptable range, it is on the high side, which limits the flexibility of the registrar when scheduling.

18. Focusing on the Lecture Halls, almost all of the spaces are being used between 8am and 6pm. Very few rooms are available, which creates a significant problem to scheduling.

19. Seminar space use peaks in the afternoon.

20. Of all room types, the peak of room use is on Tuesday and Thursday, which peaks at 85%. This number is high.

21. Building/Room Condition may have a large impact on the demand for particular Learning Environments. Many buildings are not in good shape with aging finishes and continuing ADA issues. Burt Hill will work to draw more specific connections between condition and room preference/use.

22. The Faculty Questionnaire closed on May 1st. Preliminary trends have been identified.
   a. Herter has been identified as among one of the best and one of the worst buildings on campus.
   b. Most respondents teach 1-2 courses per semester.
   c. Greatest obstacles presented by physical environment – condition of teaching space, seating configurations, and availability of appropriate instructional technologies.
   d. Respondents identify a preference to renovate and build new small learning environments over large ones. This is in conflict with the data analysis. A possible reason for this result is a difference between aspirations of the faculty and reality of the situation. Several respondents to the questionnaire did speak to this issue and identified that though more small classes and small rooms are desirable, it probably will not coincide with the public university business model.

• Findings and Recommendations

23. Burt Hill expects to see ADA modifications in almost all of the Lecture spaces, which will reduce the Lecture seat count by 10% on average. Swing space will be required in order to renovate any Lecture space since construction will likely take more than the summer to accomplish. ADA modifications are necessary.

24. For the Classroom spaces, changes in seating configurations could reduce the seat count by up to 20%, or increase the required area of new classrooms by 20%. Seating configuration changes are optional, though moving toward modern learning environment configurations will help keep the university competitive.

25. Seminar spaces should expect to see a 5% reduction in seats to update seating configurations. This reduction would be optional.

26. Many Classrooms and Seminar spaces also require ADA upgrades which should not affect seat count. Regardless, ADA modifications will be necessary and venue (configuration, furnishings, layout) upgrades will be optional.
• Other

27. The role of specialized spaces in departments to meet their program needs was discussed.
   a. Enrollment is tied to facilities – in terms of condition, maintenance, technology, accessibility, etc. This topic will be addressed in the Department Right-Sizing study, which is being conducted in parallel with the Utilization Study and the finding will be folded into the Department Learning Environment considerations.
   b. Additional UMass Classrooms may be turned over to departments in order for departments to right-size. These spaces should be identified as soon as possible since the seats lost will be identified as a need in the Utilization Study.

28. The group discussed the potential of more online and blended courses offered in place of on campus courses during the day. This may reduce some of the demand for some large lectures, though a counter argument identifies that students do not live on campus to take online courses.

29. The group would like to look into how a new Testing Facility would affect the inventory and scheduling.

30. Many departments are asking for more self-controlled space so that they can schedule longer/non-traditional class times. Analysis of this begins to require some curriculum analysis. This would help the departments to build in headroom and flexibility.

31. Many departments would like their learning environments to be centralized in order to better utilize shared and teaching materials.

32. UMass and Burt Hill need to agree on what is “scheduled for demolition” so that the planning team can understand what Learning Environments will be removed from the inventory and need to be compensated for in the future.

• Next Steps

33. UMass will deliver the ADA transition plan from Facilities to Burt Hill as well as identify what ADA repairs have been accomplished.

34. Burt Hill will begin to develop classroom program criteria for the new building, as part of a preliminary building program. Burt Hill will begin to identify the best room size/seat count sets to generate the most effective mix of Learning Environment spaces to meet the demand for currently unavailable rooms.

35. Burt Hill will begin reviewing Learning Environment trends across the country, at similar universities.

Action Items

• Burt Hill will provide a list of Specialized Learning Environments for further investigation.
• UMass will review the list of Specialized Learning Environments, identify the miscoded items and recode, describe whether or not the space should be included in the study, etc.
• UMass will provide Burt Hill with the prior study information on a Testing Facility.
• UMass and Burt Hill need to come to an understanding of what facilities are planned to be taken off line in the immediate and long term.
• UMass will provide the ADA transition plan. Sharmilla will provide a list of ADA rooms that she knows to be accessible. UMass will also provide a list of what spaces have received ADA upgrades.
• Burt Hill will begin program criteria for the new building.
• Burt Hill will gather Learning Environment trends for review.
• Burt Hill will begin to connect facility condition and utilization.
Next Meeting

Thursday, May 14th

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.
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BURT HILL
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**From:** Emily Santilli  
**May 19, 2009 (revised 12/22/09)**

**Subject/Project Number:** Classroom Vision Group

**New Academic Classroom Facilities**  
University of Massachusetts – Amherst  
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1  
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Number:</th>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>Project Phase:</th>
<th>Meeting Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>05/14/2009</td>
<td>Information Gathering (ST02)</td>
<td>Facilities Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Purpose:**

The purpose of this meeting was to present preliminary right-sizing scenarios that demonstrate future classroom need and have the Classroom Vision Group provide priorities for future modeling.

**Attendees:**

UMass Admin: Juanita Holler, Bryan Harvey, Sharmilla Muratoti, John Cunningham, John Lenzi  
Facilities Planning: Jim Cahill  
Campus Planning: Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova, Pam Rooney  
Physical Plant: Patrick Daly  
Burt,Hill: Joel Nordberg, Michael Reagan, Alex Wing, Emily Santilli, Steve Brittan, Benjamin Kou  
DCAM: Ann Storer  
Academic Representatives: Martha Baker, Patti Cromack (NRE)  
Heidi Dollard (OIT)  
Meredith Lind (Com College)  
Bernie Schliemann (Engineering)  
Ted Djafersis (COE)  
Jay Gladden (ISOM)  
Karen Schoenberger (SBS)  
Ron Michaud (CHFA)  
Ernie May (Faculty Senate)

**Distribution:**  
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan

**Comments:** The Power Point presentation of the meeting and additional documents were distributed in hand-out form and have been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.
Overview:

Burt Hill identified preliminary right-sizing of the UMass general use learning environment spaces based on prior findings and potential ideal conditions. This right-sizing further demonstrated the general use classroom need beyond current utilization pressures. Burt Hill attempted to engage the Classroom Vision group in discussion about these results, how to validate and further enhance the findings, and what priorities to hold for future modeling and new building programming.

• Data Gathering
  1. Burt Hill asked the group to identify some problem spaces as candidates for taking offline for removal from the inventory, repurposing, and/or renovation. The following were included in that list:
     a. Fernald 0011
     b. Bartlett 0065
     c. Morrill II 131
     d. Ag Engineering 119
     e. Ag Engineering 107
     f. Morrill I 129
     g. School of Management 133
     h. Goessman 0020
     i. Hasbrouck 020
     j. Hasbrouck 114
     k. Totman 024 (probably department owned)

• Scheduling
  2. John Lenzi reiterated that scheduling is accomplished on a maximizing model. Even though some faculty want breakout space scheduled with their large classrooms, this is rarely done because it does not maximize space use. The Registrar accommodates requests for breakout space by assigning those courses to larger rooms where breakout happens within the space. An optimized model would allow for breakout spaces clustered around large classrooms and/or auditoria.

• Pedagogy
  3. Not discussed

• Existing Conditions
  4. John Lenzi identified that over the past 4-5 years, each fall semester has added 3,000 new student seats. The group sees this trend leveling off in the coming semesters.

  5. This intense growth has fueled an upward swing in large auditoria usage, as identified by Bryan Harvey. (graphs were distributed during the meeting). This trend removes smaller classrooms to meet more student demand with less faculty. If this trend continues on its current path, students will not see their courses taught in smaller classrooms until the end of their 3rd year. This presents a significant impact on the curriculum.

  6. The faculty, administration, and Registrar all feel a pressure on the 40-80 seat classrooms. These feelings are to be tested/validated by the study.
• Analysis

7. Burt Hill has begun to Right-Size the existing general use learning environment inventory. This effort removes seats from the existing rooms in two waves:
   a. “Nominal Right-Sizing” – Remove seats that make the spaces feel overcrowded and inaccessible, access to all teaching walls, etc
   b. “Idealized Right-Sizing” – Develops a more ideal room layout:
      i. Remove seats to provide sufficient access to all walls in the room
      ii. Remove seats with poor viewing angles to the teaching walls
      iii. Allows instructor to move freely about the space
      iv. Explore other seating arrangements/furnishings, etc.

8. Burt Hill presented a model that demonstrates how the room types (by seat count) shift based on idealized right-sizing, taking buildings off-line, and other criteria. The modeler was called the “Calculated Learning Environment Counts.”

9. As shown by the model, Nominal Right-Sizing does not create a large redistribution of room types, though the results of Idealized Right-Sizing are fairly dramatic.

10. The current UMass practice is to provide the code-based minimum of 15 square feet per student station in each general use learning environment. Right-Sizing shows that 15 SF is not ideal. Diagrams that were distributed during the meeting demonstrated the trend toward more space allocated per student station. Depending on room type, furnishings, and other factors, that SF per student could be between 25 and 35 SF or more.

11. Burt Hill identified that the right-sizing process is applied to both new and existing learning environments.

12. The large auditoria present a different challenge. Burt Hill began to look at the special pressures on these spaces.
   a. One method is to assume a large auditorium will be part of the new building program and develop the right mix of classrooms based on what types of spaces come with it, which includes understanding enrollment patterns and other trends.
   b. Based on the group’s desire to see many large auditoria removed from the inventory and the necessary ADA upgrades that almost all the auditoria require, at least one large auditorium will probably be required in the new building, if only to act as swing space to renovate, repurpose, or take other auditoria off-line.
   c. The right mix must be developed in order to prevent the trend of increasing reliance on large auditoria that Bryan Harvey previously identified. Since the study has shown that at least some amount of large LE space will be required in the new building, the conversation should continue about the impact on the student experience.

• Findings and Recommendations

13. By right-sizing the existing general use learning environments alone, the need for additional space more than fills the available square footage in the new building.

14. Through an idealized right-sizing effort, the count of smaller rooms will increase fairly dramatically. The “Area of Opportunity” for new LE development is within the larger room types: roughly 60-150 seat range.
   a. The Registrar has identified that the current need on their end is for 40-80 seat rooms, which is further validated by the right-sizing model.
15. There is a potential for the new larger inventory of small spaces to serve the purposes of meeting department needs, especially general use small spaces nestled within department space. Another use for this new larger inventory of small rooms is to fill the discussion section need (which previous analysis has shown) as well as potentially breakout space.

16. Bryan Harvey identified that regardless of what is built, it will be filled, which is validated by the right-sizing analysis. Alex Wing stressed balancing the program between large and small classrooms to insure a good mix for a functional building and a good student experience.

17. Bryan Harvey also identified that large classes can work well if well supported. If the support is not there through the facility and other pedagogical means, medium sized classrooms would be more beneficial.

18. The group recognizes that small classes are pedagogically beneficial but not practical given the limited amount of faculty for the growing student population. So long as class size could be kept at a reasonable level, the suggestion was made to create more mid to large rooms. Following additional mid-large inventory, small-mid rooms could be upgraded to be great teaching space.

19. Bryan Harvey articulated his thoughts as follows:
   a. Take struggling large auditoria off line for renovation
   b. Build middle to large size spaces
   c. Right-Size current inventory to smaller spaces

20. Regardless of the mix, the analysis to this point identifies a clear need for at least one new large auditorium for swing space to renovate many others.

21. Alex Wing identified that the Right-Sizing provides an ideal scenario. Reality will most likely represent a mix since the new building size and other capital investments are limited. Burt Hill engaged the group in a discussion of priorities.
   a. Bryan Harvey would like to see the class sizes to remain manageable for the faculty and to minimize the increase of very large classes.
   b. Alex Wing reiterated the need for swing space and evaluating the inventory to be removed (discussed in the “Data Gathering” section).

22. The group discussed the potential program scenarios for the new building:
   a. 100% general use learning environment space; no offices, departmental spaces, or specialized learning environments.
   b. 80%/20% general use learning environment space with a small portion of offices and departmental spaces, no specialized learning environments.
   c. A mix of general use learning environments, offices, departmental spaces, and specialized learning environments.

23. The group identified that the programming of the new building may have to take into account other buildings that may be taken off line within a similar timetable in order to accommodate disrupted departments. Irrespective of the new building, such departments will have to be reconciled within the comprehensive plan.

24. Susan Personnette reiterated the parallel tracks of the Utilization Study for the new building program and the comprehensive plan. Though all general use learning environment need may not be met in the new building, it should be planned for in additional future facilities.

25. Because of the large need that has been established, Burt Hill has identified the logistical challenge to be met.

26. The group reiterated a need for community spaces within the new building program. Burt Hill agrees and will account for this in the new building program.
• Other

27. Representatives from OIT raised the issue of technology in the classrooms. The discussion that followed identified that classroom technology stretches beyond AV requirements into viewing angles, access to power/data, furnishings that enable technology use, infrastructure, etc. The first level of addressing these issues is through right-sizing of the existing spaces to help meet these criteria. The next level is in planning new space to accommodate increased technology usage as well as flexibility for future technology advancements. This discussion will continue as specific room types are designed and developed.

28. The group would like Burt Hill to continue to evaluate and provide scenarios for specialized and departmental space within the new building program. This effort is ongoing.

• Next Steps

29. Burt Hill will develop a model to generate the preliminary new building program including types of learning environments, sizes, and layouts.

30. Efforts completed in this phase can transition into the Certifiable Study and Burt Hill will continue to move in that direction. Burt Hill will begin to document in a report what UMass has today in terms of general use learning environments that also outlines right-sizing and future need.

31. Burt Hill will complete a benchmarking analysis with peer institutions. Some institutions identified in the meeting were UConn and Michigan. Beyond space use and room type mix, Burt Hill will develop information on pedagogical trends, new teaching models, blended instruction, etc.

Action Items

• Burt Hill will present benchmarking from peer institutions.
• Burt Hill will present educational trends.
• Burt Hill will present a preliminary building program based on our analysis and recent group discussions.

Next Meeting

Thursday, May 28th

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.
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From: Emily Santilli June 1, 2009 (Revised 12/22/09)

Subject/Project Number: Classroom Vision Group

New Academic Classroom Facilities
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Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 4
Meeting Date: May 28, 2009
8:00am – 9:30am
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: UMass Facilities & Campus Planning Office

Meeting Purpose:
Department Utilization & General Project Overview

Attendees:

UMass Admin: Bryan Harvey, John Lenzi, John Cunningham, Sharmilla Muratoli
Facilities Planning: Jim Cahill
Campus Planning: Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova
UMass Faculty: Karen Shoenerberger, Meredith Lind, Martha Baker, Heidi Dollard, Ted Djaferis, Rod Warnick
Burt,Hill: Joel Nordberg, Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Alex Wing
DCAM: Ann Storer

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan, Steve Brittan, Joel Nordberg

Comments: The Power Point presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference. This presentation is an expansion of the one given to the Academic Vision Group on May 21st.

Overview
1. Alex presented modern learning environment design trends and benchmarking of peer institutions. Preliminary classroom right-sizing and potential new building programs were also presented. The effect of right-sizing will increase the SF per student station and reduce the seat count across campus. Alex also identified that the new building is an opportunity to push the campus in a direction by making a statement of how the faculty wants to teach now and into the future.

Data Gathering
2. Progress on the Student and Faculty questionnaires was discussed. Both questionnaires have now been closed and analysis has begun.

a. Student responses came from all academic levels. Students appear to have experienced all room sizes and they are fairly satisfied, though further analysis of the open-ended questions will expand upon that.
Smaller rooms are preferred (40 or less). The students identify the best learning environments in SOM. They value room condition, thermal comfort, lighting/daylight, and access to technology.

b. The Faculty also prefers smaller rooms and identified SOM as having the best learning environments. They feel the poor condition of the classrooms is a significant problem that limits their effectiveness.

3. Alex presented benchmark data that identified UMass classrooms along with classrooms from Berkley, UConn, BU, and MIT. The SF per Student FTE was also benchmarked against SCUP data. SCUP identifies an average 7.8 SF/FTE whereas UMass has roughly 6.2 SF/FTE, meaning +/- 47,000 SF less than the SCUP target. Burt Hill has been asked to find more utilization data for UConn if possible so more in-depth benchmark analysis may be presented.

4. Based on a previous Classroom Vision group meeting, Alex presented the following rooms being considered for taking offline: Fernald 11, Bartlett 65, Morrill II 131, Ag Engineering 119 and 107, Morrill I 129, School of Management 133, Goessman 20, Hasbrouck 20 and 114, and Totman 24 (which may be a departmental space).

5. Ann Storer identified that DCAM considers 22 SF per student station to be the accepted average student station size. UMass is currently using 15 SF on average. This is another means of defining need.

Scheduling

6. Alex reviewed the schedule and assigned ideal room sizes and types to various courses. This process yielded minimal apparent need for rooms with 81-150 seats. Sharmilla identified that several faculty request rooms with 81-150 seats. Since there is a current lack of rooms available in this size range, the faculty do not get them and structure their courses accordingly. Sharmilla and John Lenzi identified that if rooms in this size range were available, faculty would request them.

7. John Lenzi also promoted the TEAL classroom (described below in “Pedagogy”) as a means of alleviating scheduling pressures. Many faculty currently request larger rooms than the class size they will have in order to move the seats around for teaming. TEAL classrooms are made for this purpose and would fill a need.

Pedagogy

8. Alex presented the Boyer Commission Study on reinventing undergraduate education. Many of the recommendations directly affect the learning environment. The key items presented were: 1) moving with ease from media enabled to face-to-face contact, 2) creating opportunities for peer mentoring, and 3) making room for individuals to find their voice. All of these items have impacts on the learning environment ranging from increased emphasis on interactions and the supporting technologies, opportunities/space/furnishings for teaming, and interdisciplinary connections.

9. Alex also presented research from the AACU (Association of American Colleges and Universities) report, which identifies that effective instruction and support are the key drivers behind a good educational experience over class size. Part of moving toward modern learning environments will be a change in curriculum and the support of that effort.

10. The TEAL classroom at MIT was presented as a large classroom where teaming and interaction are emphasized. This setup is an example of effectively lecturing to large groups of students. The attendees at the meeting identified that they could use this type of room.

11. Alex presented that modern classroom buildings tend to be interdisciplinary and complete with programmed public resources space. Media permeates the building, along with food service and other student amenities to animate the building and create community. Significant discussion within the group debated the effectiveness of this model versus creating more classroom space.
a. Susan Personette identified the spaces in and out of the classroom as the complete learning environment. Alex added that the public spaces could function with the curriculum and that faculty engagement would be beneficial. Alex termed these more informal public spaces “Team Resource Areas.”

b. John Cunningham opposed the idea of programmed public areas in a general academic building in favor of building more classroom area and adding more seats to the inventory. John identified that the classroom problem on campus is too large to not build as much classroom space as possible and that programmed public spaces is more appropriate in a departmental building.

c. Bryan Harvey suggested that the new building should be built for how the faculty wants to teach and not how they have been teaching. Bryan also suggested that the new building have rules: that if you want to use these classrooms you have to engage the pedagogical philosophy of the building. Bryan appreciated how the concept of programmed public space supports interdisciplinary learning.

d. Bryan also identified that he wanted to give as many students on campus as possible a “School of Management” experience, especially since classrooms within that facility received the highest ratings.

e. Jim Cahill identified that the School of Nursing in Skinner breaks out into small formal seminar/breakout rooms, which may be an option in the new building instead of programmed public space. Susan Personette identified a need for both formal and informal small teaming areas, as well as a potential need for large breakout spaces.

f. Karen Shoenberger identified that programmed public space is most effective when connected or adjacent to a department. Her opinion is that faculty and student interaction will be most effective when near the faculty offices. The group discussed that such spaces should be associated with departments all over campus. Burt Hill identified this as part of the departmental analysis which currently is working on the same concept.

g. The group discussed small glass-enclosed case study or teaming rooms as an option. This type of room could be scheduled and bridge the public and classroom space.

h. The group discussed a Learning Commons model as another means of programming and activating the public space. There was concern if the building does not have active public space, it may feel like a sterile environment.

i. Alex asked the group to consider this concept as a program for public space and to not accept the public spaces of the building as merely circulation.

j. Bryan Harvey indicated that a spectrum of spaces would be most useful. The classrooms could be larger (60-150 seat range), which would add more efficiency. The question of small learning environments is one for the comprehensive plan across campus. Bryan identified the need to “put your money where the people are.” Since the new building may house as much as 2/3 of all general instruction, there will be a significant amount of students using the building. Since the student is the paying customer, they should be given a good and effective experience.

k. Alex identified that the programmed public space should probably not be set up as a lounge in order to facilitate productivity. The group agreed that lounge spaces would be used differently.

I. The group also identified that Alumni may be willing to contribute to programmed public space, which would allow more resources to be used for classrooms.

12. Alex continued the discussion of potential community within the building by asking the group what kind of community they wanted to create. The building will contain some percentage of department space which will help to animate the building. An additional community element could be food service.

a. Bryan Harvey identified that since thousands of people will be using this building everyday, food service will be needed. John Lenzi agreed by saying if the building is sited in the center of campus and does not provide food, it will be a revolving door.
b. Jim Cahill identified that food service could be profitable for the university. The challenges will be with maintenance of the classrooms when students bring their food into class. Jim identified a need for a cultural shift where the faculty reinforces classroom maintenance and the students take their trash out of the room. Regardless, Jim feels that the food must be put where the density of people are.

c. The group identified a need to create a culture of recycling and build that into the student experience/mentality.

d. It was said that SOM has no food service, which was identified as a problem. Though the culture of recycling at SOM has been successful.

e. Karen Shoenberger identified Thompson as a place on campus where food service is adjacent to lecture halls. She asked the group weather or not they thought that space worked. Indications were that it does.

f. Jim Cahill would like to see maintenance as part of the food service discussion.

13. Susan Personette identified the need to manage the crowd of students that will be flowing through the new building. Part of the management may be resolved with increased circulation spaces, spaces for students to wait for classes, and other programmed public spaces. Alex will begin to look at crowd analysis.

14. Ideas for transforming the large lecture hall scenario were presented. Other than the TEAL model, blended courses, webcasts, and other extensions of the learning environment were presented.

15. Alex also discussed changes in technology that can make larger classrooms more effective teaching environments. Multiple projectors can alleviate sightline issues and engage students in all areas of the room. This may be a method of improving some existing classrooms that do not have ideal geometries.

Existing Conditions

16. Classroom right sizing was discussed. Alex identified that the learning environments tend to be overfilled on average by surpassing their target percent full of between 60 and 70%. Lecture halls/auditoria have a target of 70 to 75%, which is also being surpassed. Both put pressure on the existing inventory and scheduling. There is little room for flexibility and overhead.

17. Another pressure on classroom right sizing is the student station size. Current UMass practice is to provide one student station for every 15 NSF (on average). Modern learning environment design and pedagogy drives a larger student station size. DCAM uses an average of 22 NSF per student station. Alex presented classroom plans that showed the existing condition (15 NSF per student station), an improved layout (roughly 19 NSF), and idealized scenarios (roughly 26-32 NSF, depending on furnishings). This exercise demonstrates that if existing classrooms were right-sized, reduced seat counts would result that would have a significant effect on the existing inventory. New classrooms will need to be built larger to accommodate the same number of students.

Analysis

18. The overall effect of classroom right-sizing on the existing inventory will be a shift toward rooms with fewer chairs. Density in the inventory will shift toward lower capacity rooms (< 20 and 20-40 seats). This shift presents an opportunity to build new in the larger sizes (60-150 seat rooms).

19. Alex presented a need-analysis with a count of various room sizes based on the current course schedule. The group would like to see this same analysis with seat counts.

Findings and Recommendations

20. Alex presented many different room layout types, including ideal rooms for tablet arm chairs, seminar (tables and chairs), lecture, and multi-venue.

21. Potential new building programs were presented and discussed. It was agreed that the new building will not be a complete singular answer for the inventory need or to take entire buildings offline, though it is an opportunity to add classroom seats to the inventory and be the catalyst for change across the campus. The potential scenarios presented were as follows:
a. 100% Classrooms – Large, no departmental space
   1) (corrected post meeting) 8-80 seats, 12-100 seats, 5-150 seats, 4-250 seats, 3-350 seats, 1-500 seats, 2-10 seat specialized (4810 seats)
   2) Question of logistics – moving that many students in and out effectively everyday
   3) Limited sense of community or campus life

b. 100% Classrooms – Mix of sizes, no departmental space
   1) (corrected post meeting) 8-40 seats, 8-60 seats, 10-80 seats, 6-100 seats, 2-150 seats, 2-350 seats, 1-500 seats, 2-10 seat specialized (3720 seats)
   2) Still a large seat count, same concerns

c. Replace Hills Hall – example of a roughly 40% Classroom/60% Departmental split
   1) (corrected post meeting) 8-80 seats, 4-100 seats, 1-400 seats (1440 seats)
   2) Losing 166 seats in Hills when it goes offline, net gain 1274 seats
   3) Does not add much space to the classroom inventory, not too much of a mix
   4) Group identified that adding only one auditorium will not be sufficient to provide additional seats and swing space to renovate existing auditoria

d. Replace Bartlett Hall – example of a roughly 50/50 split
   1) (corrected post meeting) 2-80 seats, 4-100 seats, 3-150 seats, 2-200 seats (1410 seats)
   2) Losing 1252 seats in Bartlett when it goes offline, net gain 158 seats
   3) Adds very few seats to the classroom inventory, but presents a better mix
   4) Would probably not take all of Bartlett offline at once. This example is meant to show what a 50/50 split in the new building could look like

e. Replace South College – example of a roughly 80/20 split
   1) (corrected post meeting) 18-80 seats, 5-100 seats, 2-250 seats, 1-350 seats, 1-400 seats (3190 seats)
   2) No UMass Classroom seats lost in South College, net gain 3190 seats
   3) 20% for departmental space does not present much flexibility for that space in the new building and does not allow for too many options of what to put there.

f. Relocate LARP into new building Option – example of one department relocation
   1) (corrected post meeting) 8-80 seats, 10-100 seats, 2-150 seats, 2-350 seats, 1-400 seats (3040 seats)
   2) Shifting one department to the new building may not be enough to unlock enough issues on campus.

22. The group agreed that the new classroom building will not solve the entire problem of another building (eg: Hills Hall). The group also understands that part of the comprehensive plan is to look at additional buildings and departmental shifts over the long term. Alex identified that this new building will become part of the campus fabric and whatever decisions are made as to how the space is divided (classroom v. departmental) and what departments move there will have to be viable in the long term.

a. Bryan Harvey reinforced the backfill concept that when opportunities are unlocked around campus, buildings other than the new one may be able to alleviate several departmental issues.

b. Jim Cahill believes the new building can resolve the Hills issue both by taking some space directly as well as unlock other opportunities on campus.
23. Ann Storer asked the group how many seats they would like to gain in their inventory. The group discussed this and found that the bigger question is what the right split between classroom and departmental space will be. Karen Shoenberger suggested at 60% classroom and 40% departmental space may resolve more issues.

24. Jim Cahill identified that there are two major issues competing when it comes to planning the program of the new building: existing facilities concerns and program concerns. Jim asked the questions of what can this building solve and what does this building do for the campus? Susan Personette asked Burt Hill to prepare program models that address both program and facility issues.

25. Alex identified several building program goals, including creating a strong learning community and active environment for a successful classroom building. This goal can be achieved by mixing learning environment types, providing departmental anchors, and enhancing student life. The building program must also be matched to its height in order to address logistical issues.

Other

26. No discussion

Next Steps

27. Susan Personette asked whether or not it makes sense to have several thousand seats in one classroom building. Burt Hill will develop examples of buildings with high seat counts for presentation.

28. Burt Hill will continue to look at the new building program from various angles and present additional opportunities.

Action Items

- Burt Hill to complete a targeted departmental analysis of those departments with the greatest needs to facilitate further new building program option discussions.
- Burt Hill will schedule a meeting with John Lenzi and Sharmilla Muratoli to discuss scheduling issues.
- Burt Hill will move toward completing a draft of the Utilization Study Report on initial findings and inventory condition.

Next Meeting:
To be scheduled
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From: Emily Santilli

July 31, 2009 (revised 12/22/09)

Subject/Project Number: Classroom Vision Group (Prep Meeting)

UMass Amherst - Classroom Utilization
Burt Hill Project 08825.01

Meeting Number: Prep Meeting 2
Meeting Date: 07/21/2009
Project Phase: ST02
Meeting Location: Facilities Building

Meeting Purpose: Classroom Planning Review

To review with John Lenzi and Bryan Harvey the needs, priorities, and new building program mix.

Attendees: Distribution:
Burt Hill – Emily Santilli, Alex Wing, Carol Harris, Joel Nordberg
Registrar’s Office – John Lenzi, Sharmilla Muratoli
Provost’s Office – Bryan Harvey
Campus Planning – Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM – Ann Storer

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing,
Pavlova, Alex Wing,
Michael Reagan, Steve Brittian, Joel Nordberg

Comments:

1. Alex Wing identified the various factors that generate classroom needs on campus:
   • Overuse of classroom seats
   • Overcrowding of seats in classrooms
   • Future Auditorium Renovations
   • Increases in enrollment

2. Bryan Harvey identified additional measures the University is undertaking to help alleviate the need internally by providing more blended courses (with some or all portions of instruction online) and changing some courses from 3 to 4 credit hours, which would minimize a student’s required in-class time over a college career and reduce the need. These factors are to be subtracted from the above list.

3. Burt Hill’s first pass at the need assessment is driven from the existing conditions and current schedule. Bryan Harvey addressed the need from the future standpoint and how a new building would affect current use and meet demand. Burt Hill will work to refine both methods and develop a unified need assessment.

4. Similar to the building assessment portion of the study, Burt Hill is developing a method for addressing the classroom needs at minimal, moderate, and significant levels. Below represents the baseline arguments for each level. Further definition of other issues to be resolved under each level will be developed.

   a. The Constrained Plan assumes there is only funding for a new building a little to no right-sizing will occur on existing learning environments. This plan points toward a 50/50 split in the new building between classroom and department space.

   b. The Moderate Plan assumes a new building and 50% of the existing classrooms are right-sized. This plan allows for a 60/40 split.
c. The **Ideal Plan** assumes a new building on 80-100% of the existing classrooms are right-sized. This plan suggests a 70/30 split. (All plans then suggest at least 30% departmental space in the new building.)

5. Regardless of which method is selected for consensus, the overall need on the campus remains the same, as identified by the ideal plan. As identified by Bryan Harvey, “The purpose of this building is to make life better.” Based on financial, time, and other constraints identified by the University, the ideal will most likely be unattainable at this time. Regardless, the University believes that whatever is chosen for the new building should be sufficient to at least “make life better.”

6. Alex Wing engaged the group in a discussion about the programmed mix of spaces in the new building. John Lenzi agreed that the focus should be on larger classrooms to effectively meet the need.

7. For large classrooms, the group gave Burt Hill direction to focus on Case Method style rooms (horseshoe seating of tables and chairs, potentially in tiered rows). Everyone agreed that smaller classes can function better in a Case Method style room over an auditorium and they are preferable among the faculty. This style of room can meet the industry calling for more collaborative spaces while still using area efficiently. The group suggested a 3:1 or 4:1 ratio between Case Method rooms and large Table and Chair rooms of 60-80 seats.

8. Alex Wing identified that 80 Tablet Arm Chairs in one rooms is probably not advisable for future construction, even though many examples exist in the current inventory, to which the group agreed. Burt Hill will limit new construction of Tablet Arm Chairs rooms to less than 60 seats.

9. The group considers auditoria the constant for the new building and the large classrooms as variables. Auditoria need to be provided to allow existing auditoria in poor condition to come offline or shift to a lower utilization. A deliberate underutilization will give the Registrar’s office more flexibility in scheduling as well as allow for renovations wherever possible. Bryan Harvey identified the auditoria that he believes must be covered in the short term:
   - Goesmann 20 (159 seats)
   - Fernald 11 (128 seats)
   - Morrill 131 (208 seats)
   - Bartlett 65 (334 seats)

10. Based on the above list, at least one new auditorium will have to be roughly 350 seats, one at 250, and 2 at 150. Two additional 150 auditoria may be constructed to act as swing space for renovation and increase the auditorium inventory. The group agreed on these assumptions.

11. Bryan Harvey identified two driving factors for both the comprehensive plan and new building plan:
   a. There will be less instructional staff (faculty and TAs) in the future
   b. The money needs to be put where the people are, and since the new building will be the most highly utilized, as many resources as possible will probably be dedicated to it.
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MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA

December 17, 2009

Subject/Project Number: Team Meeting

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:

2/27/09 ST02 Information Gathering F&CP, Rm 243

Meeting Purpose:
Preparation & presentation review for the 3/5 meeting with the Deans

Attendees: Distribution:

UMass: Juanita Holler, Joyce Hatch, Jim Cahill, Bryan Harvey, Susan Personette, Pat Daly, Pam Rooney, Ludmilla Pavlova

DCAM: Ann Storer

Burt Hill: Michael Reagan, Jeff Funovits, Joel Nordberg

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Michael Reagan

Comments: The meeting followed the Campus Vision presentation

The following is a list of points that need to be emphasized in the first presentation and meeting with the Deans.

1. The Deans need to be made aware of the study process including classroom and departmental utilization. (SP)
2. All of the material on a slide needs to be legible. Spread sheets may have to be simplified and redone in Power Point. (SP)
3. The presentation should explain the building survey study also. Abbreviations should not be used in the building slides.
4. The number of seats in a building is generally more relevant than the number of classrooms and the table in the presentation should be revised to indicate seat counts. (BH)
5. The building survey should include building attributes and a timeframe for demolition, renovation and new construction. (JC)
6. It is okay to reference the upcoming faculty/department head questionnaire with the Deans.
7. It is important to verify the faculty population and growth factors (SP). BH noted the difficulty of establishing a basis for growth. Joyce H noted that projections on growth should come from the Chancellor.
8. Joyce H also noted that growth might be approached differently, from a desired class size (trends) discussion.
9. Current electronic data on populations is not fully up to date. (BH) The facilities database (Horizon) is not tied in with personnel/human resources population data.

10. Discussions with Department heads should address strategic internal plans they have in place or need (LP).

11. JC suggested that meetings will be most effective if we present information and request verification rather than trying to draw out information in the meetings. Interaction in the Vision Group meetings is very desirable nonetheless (Jaunita H).

12. AS noted that the planning study is not a detailed programming of all academic facilities but a broader perspective which includes establishing how much new space is needed.

13. The presentation needs a good opening explanation of the criteria and goals.

14. It was agreed that the presentation needs a more intensive work session which was scheduled for Monday, 3/2 in Amherst.
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From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA  December 17, 2009

Subject/Project Number: Team Meeting

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Number:</th>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>Project Phase:</th>
<th>Meeting Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/2/09</td>
<td>ST03 Information Gathering</td>
<td>Amherst, F&amp;CP office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Purpose:
Work session on Power Point presentation to Deans on 3/5/09

Attendees:
UMass: Ludmilla Pavlova  For Record
Burt Hill: Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg
By Conference/EMeeting:
UMass: Susan Personette,
DCAM: Ann Storer
Burt Hill: Alex Wing

Comments:

1. The project Organization chart needs to be redone.
2. Susan will do the welcome and introductions while speaking from the schedule slide.
3. It would be good to solicit feedback from the Deans who are also involved in the science study (what worked well, what did not?).
4. The slide image of a generic academic building is to be removed.
5. The schedule timeline should show symbols of roughly where various vision and academic group meetings are likely to take place. A line indicating the current point on the schedule should also be added.
6. A classroom utilization process introduction slide is needed.
7. Peer group comparisons of classroom utilization data would be very valuable and should be added.
8. Early conclusions should also be made in the presentation.
9. An early discussion should take place that speaks to space that may not be serving educational needs well.
10. Alex Wing was reworking the use, over time graphs and breaking out the information into two charts (Mon, Wed, Friday & Tuesday Thursday).
11. A slide is needed to address room quality (condition, seats, technology, lighting, etc.)
12. A slide with the list of departments in the study will be added.
13. The campus plan, site selection slides need to be updated.
14. A draft of the meeting agenda will be distributed for review and comment.
15. The department tour process slide needs to be redone.
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From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA

December 17, 2009

Subject/Project Number: New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1  Meeting Date: 3/5/09  Project Phase: ST02 Information Gathering  Meeting Location: F&CP Room 243

Meeting Purpose: Project Overview with Academic Vision Group

Attendees: Distribution:
UMass: Joyce Hatch, Juanita Holler, John Cunningham, Bryan Harvey, Charlena Seymour, John Lenzi
Susan Personette, Jim Cahill, Ludmilla Pavlova, Pam Rooney, Jay Schafer, Stephen Burns, Marjorie Aelron, Martha Baker, Meredith Lind, Jay Gladden, Ted Djaferis, Christine McCormick, Karen Schoenberger, Janet Rifkin, Joel Martin
DCAM: Michael Williams, Ann Storer, Ellen Whittemore
Burt Hill: Alex Wing, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

For Record

Comments: A project overview was presented with preliminary findings. The Power Point presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.

1. Jim Cahill gave introductions and a brief project overview.
2. A presentation was given that outlined the structure of the team and project, emphasizing the two pronged nature of the project and distinguishing between the comprehensive academic plan and the certifiable building study for the new academic classroom building.
3. Schedule discussions in the presentation emphasized that site selection and enough departmental and classroom programming work and direction needs to be established in the first 3 months of the project to begin the building study in June.
4. Preliminary findings were presented for the buildings, classrooms and site selection for the new academic building. The process for department interviews was introduced. Actual interviews are scheduled to begin the week of 3/12.
5. A comparison of classroom utilization data with other peer, research universities was requested.
6. Opinions about preserving or demolishing South College and Draper Hall were mixed.

7. Classroom utilization does not take into account exam use, prep sessions and other unscheduled uses that tax the available resources.

8. Overall utilization needs to factor in residence hall classrooms that are only scheduled for overflow when no other UMass classroom space can be found.

9. The group was outspoken about the negative impact of overfilled classrooms and pedagogy that must be shaped by available rooms.

10. Rooms are not available for long block use. Viewing films in particular is a frequent scheduling problem.

11. The group was notified that there would be a faculty questionnaire circulated later in March.

12. Department space tours should have an emphasis on seeing poor space and spaces that do not meet program needs.

13. FC&P proposed pushing back the construction completion date on the DCAM schedule to allow the building study to begin later. This would allow more time for the building program to evolve and take more information from the department interviews and classroom analysis. The University only needs 2 weeks to occupy a new building.

14. As soon as possible after the department interviews and tours, a shortlist of departments that might be a good fit for the new building should be assembled.

15. Department verification meetings will likely take through July and with summer vacation schedules it was proposed that consideration should be given to not starting solutions and options planning meetings until September.

16. Coordination with the Wilson science plan was referenced. There are some classrooms in their study areas and some Department information in overlap areas that needs to be transferred.

17. UMass will be getting proposals for academic library planners to do a special utilization study for the library which will help determine how much space in the library might be repurposed.
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From: Joel E. Nordberg

May 9, 2009 (revised 12/29/09)

Subject/Project Number: Academic Vision Group

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2  Meeting Date: 7 May, 2009 8:30 – 10:00  Project Phase: Initial Observations from Information Gathering  Meeting Location: UMass Facilities & Campus Planning Office

Meeting Purpose:

Department Utilization & General Project Overview

Attendees:

UMass Admin: Joyce Hatch, Juanita Holler, Paul Kostecki, Bryan Harvey, John Lenzi
Facilities Planning: Jim Cahill, Pam Rooney, Cleve Carrens
Campus Planning: Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova
Physical Plant: Pat Daly
UMass Faculty: Marjorie Aelion, Anthony Butterfield, Priscilla Clarkson, John Cunningham, Steve Goodwin, Jim Kurose, John Lenzi, Bernie Schliemann, Joel Martin, Christine McCormick, Janet Rifkin, Jay Schofer, Jean Winney, Stephen Burns, Karen Shoenberger
Burt,Hill: Joel Nordberg, Michael Reagan, Jeff Funovits, Steve Brittan, Emily Santilli, Janeen Jaworski
DCAM: Ann Storer

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan

Comments: A project update was presented with the primary focus being on the progress and early observations from the Department utilization interviews and data analysis. The Power Point presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.

Introduction and General Discussions

1. The Burt Hill scope has been expanded to include analyzing the use of classroom spaces in the sciences and engineering buildings.
   a. Information on condition and functional set up of the science class labs will be conveyed to Burt Hill by Wilson Architects.
b. A concern was raised that no programming was done for the Science facilities. Ann Storer stated that Wilson Architects has engaged Ricks Associates to do the programming work on the science facilities. This has not been done as of yet.

c. Other gaps in the Science survey for advising and dean’s spaces were brought up.

2. Schedule & State Funding:

a. The critical importance of getting the dual track (Academic Plan and the Certifiable Building Study) up and running was emphasized.

b. Burt Hill has been asked to prepare a critical path schedule to highlight what information and decisions are needed to launch and keep the Study going.

c. A general consensus was expressed that the Vision Group would make itself available over the summer to maintain momentum. The challenge going forward will be to gather and focus on the right information to make good decisions.

d. With regard to programming, it was expressed that a strong case seems to be emerging to support a classroom building with minimal office space. Burt Hill noted that it is not uncommon for general academic buildings to be planned and built before the occupants and ultimate program is established.

3. Ann Storer raised the concern that some of the science cross-over (heavy research) departments (i.e. Psychology & Linguistics) have significant space needs that should be considered.

Campus Vision/Site Development Update:

4. Site selection criteria:

a. Selection of the new building site is focused on clear sites, requiring no building demolition or extensive renovation of existing buildings.

b. Specs are underway and University apartments area planned to come down over the summer pending the relocation of the last remaining occupants. This site could fill a parking or swing parking need.

c. The demolition of Hills House requires relocating a great number of occupants which cannot happen immediately. A point was made that the strategy for Hills demolition should be to avoid expensive deferred maintenance.

d. Sites Under Consideration:

1) Lot west of Whitmore (pros: open, high visibility site – cons: generates more student traffic around and across Commonwealth Avenue, requires at least temporary relocation of important parking).

2) Lot 62 (pros: open site, high visibility; cons: loses parking and the lot is already scheduled to absorb parking lost to the new science building, forces another pedestrian key street crossing; pro/con debatable: expands academic core to the east).

3) South College (pros: prominent site that could enhance the center campus hub; cons: hard to get a building of the necessary scale on the site without removal of SC, time to get approval for removal or major alteration of SC does not fit project timeline).

4) Draper – similar issues to South College.

5) Tennis Court Site (pros: open site, could work with new rec. center building to enhance west side hub; cons: does not do enough to enhance campus fabric, vertical profile of the site could push program space below grade or add fill cost, level bridge connector to Goodell or campus mall level seems awkward and too low at road crossing).

5. General Consideration Points

a. The building will be of a scale and significance that it must be thought of as a student academic center. It should be a “student building” and convey a sense of community and enhance student life.
b. Program that augments student union functions should be considered for the new building.

c. A case was made for the idea of a new student hub in the north campus via the Draper site.

d. A case was made that the campus lacks density and could be enhanced with a significant building in the center campus area.

6. The evaluation matrix should be expanded to include a rating for improvement to student life.

**Building Condition Update:**

7. Buildings are being ranked and grouped according to: those in very good condition that need to be maintained as such; buildings that should be upgraded with an aggressive capital maintenance program (accomplished while on line); buildings that make a significant contribution to the campus but require more extensive renovation (accomplished while off line); building in poor condition but worthy of special consideration due to historic considerations; and, buildings that should be removed from the inventory.

8. Buildings are being considered according to their contribution and value to the long range academic plan.

9. The new building long range planning and the building condition and backfill tracks will begin to merge once the first new building site is selected.

**Classroom Utilization Update:**

10. Recent efforts have focused around delineating between general use classroom and special use instructional spaces so that true utilization patterns can be documented and supported. There are 257 general use classrooms and 312 special use rooms in the current inventory list.

11. Many special use rooms fall into the sub-categories of class labs, seminar rooms, residential program classrooms and departmental classrooms for which scheduling information is incomplete and requires a different type of use model.

12. Classrooms in buildings should also be depicted in enrolled seats per building and not strictly by the number of classrooms per building or seat count. A seminar class taught in the Rand Theater, because there is no available alternative, was discussed as a case in point where the results would be distorted by the number of available seats verses the enrollment in the course.

13. Utilization mapping over time is also being tracked.

14. Right sizing will be impacted by two key seat count adjustments: occupancy will be diminished by making rooms (particularly auditoria) accessible; rooms are currently over-crowed with tablet arm chairs which, if changed to allow tables and chairs and multiple teaching walls, will reduce the seat counts per room. A 10 to 20% reduction factor should be anticipated.

15. The faculty survey will be reopened to try and get a larger cross sample. 330 faculty responses were received while over 5,000 student responses have been received to their survey.

16. The point was made that teaching methods are continually transitioning with more on-line course work, small group break-out work, blended teaching styles, etc. The impact of these changes on classroom use should be taken into consideration also.

17. Going forward, the impact of adding various classroom sizes into the inventory will need to be studied and presented.

18. Some auditoria and classrooms need to be taken off-line all together (Fernald 11 for example). A list of these rooms needs to be developed with UMass.

19. A comfortable seat fill head room factor needs to be established for future modeling.

20. The difficulty of getting scheduling data on department controlled space is unique in Burt Hill’s experience. A central scheduling software system could track rooms controlled by the University and scheduled by the registrar; and, those controlled and scheduled by other entities.

**Department Utilization**
21. A first round of department tours and interviews has been completed with the exception of one or two added programs. A second round of meetings is underway to confirm data and conditions.

22. Personnel records have been used for head count information and horizon data for existing space information.

23. The methodology for “right-sizing” includes: departmental tours, interviews, analysis of personnel and area data, correcting the existing areas, adjusting per personnel, adjusting for UMass standards, adjusting per observation and recommendation. UMass standard room/office sizes are being used.

24. Establishing standards for unique spaces like practice rooms, studio space, etc. needs to be worked out with the departments.

25. Charts of existing space and right-sized space were projected based on a first pass, unfiltered data. This information will be checked and adjusted over the course of the next round of meetings and independently.

26. Growth will need to be based on meetings with the Colleges in accordance with the 2020 goals. The figures shown need to be expanded to include graduate students.

27. Backfill opportunities need to be considered and capitalized on in going forward in the planning.

28. The point was made that department analysis should also identify needs that cannot be deferred.

29. A relocation matrix is also being developed to rank considerations and conditions that will influence planning considerations due to buildings that must be emptied and departments that should be consolidated or expanded.

**Conclusion**

30. The urgency of making timely decisions was emphasized.
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### MEETING MINUTES

**From:** Emily Santilli

**June 1, 2009 (revised 12/30/09)**

**Subject/Project Number:**

**New Academic Classroom Facilities**
**University of Massachusetts – Amherst**
**Mass State Project:** UMA0801 ST1
**Burt Hill Project 08825.00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Number</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Project Phase:</th>
<th>Meeting Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>May 21, 2009 1:30pm – 3:30pm</td>
<td>Information Gathering ST02</td>
<td>UMass Facilities &amp; Campus Planning Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Purpose:**

Department Utilization & General Project Overview

**Attendees:**
- **UMass Admin:** Joyce Hatch, Paul Kostecki, Bryan Harvey, John Lenzi
- **Facilities Planning:** Jim Cahill, Pam Rooney
- **Campus Planning:** Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova
- **Physical Plant:** Patrick Daly
- **UMass Faculty:** Ron Michaud, Marjorie Aelion, Steve Goodwin, Jim Kurose, Bernie Schliemann, Christine McCormick, Meredith Lind, Terry Warner, Martha Baker
- **Burt, Hill:** Joel Nordberg, Michael Reagan, Steve Brittan, Emily Santilli, Carol Harris, Alex Wing
- **DCAM:** Ann Storer

**Distribution:**
- Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan, Steve Brittan, Joel Nordberg

**Comments:** A project update was presented with the primary focus being on the progress of the Classroom Utilization analysis. The Power Point presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.
Classroom Utilization Update:

1. Alex presented the Boyer Commission Study on reinventing undergraduate education. Many of the recommendations directly affect the learning environment. The key items presented were: 1) moving with ease from media enabled to face-to-face contact, 2) creating opportunities for peer mentoring, and 3) making room for individuals to find their voice. All of these items have impacts on the learning environment ranging from increased emphasis on interactions and the supporting technologies, opportunities/space/furnishings for teaming, and interdisciplinary connections.

2. The TEAL classroom at MIT was presented as a large classroom where teaming and interaction are emphasized. This setup is an example of effectively lecturing to large groups of students.

3. Alex presented that modern classroom buildings tend to be interdisciplinary and complete with programmed public resources space. Media permeates the building, along with food service and other student amenities to animate the building and create community.

4. Ideas for transforming the large lecture hall scenario were presented. Other than the TEAL model, blended courses, webcasts, and other extensions of the learning environment were discussed.

5. Progress on the Student and Faculty questionnaires was discussed. Both questionnaires have now been closed and analysis has begun.
   a. Student responses came from all academic levels. Students appear to have experienced all room sizes and they are fairly satisfied, though further analysis of the open-ended questions will expand upon that. Smaller rooms are preferred (40 or less). The students identify the best learning environments in SOM. They value room condition, thermal comfort, lighting/daylight, and access to technology.
   b. The Faculty also prefers smaller rooms and identified SOM as having the best learning environments. They feel the poor condition of the classrooms is a significant problem that limits their effectiveness. The faculty identified the following as limiting: condition of space, availability of technology, seating configuration, scheduling issues, overcrowding, and line of sight/access to teaching wall(s). The questionnaire shows that the faculty feels it is less important to construct/renovate large rooms. The fact that only a small percentage of the faculty teach in the very large rooms should be considered. For large rooms, tiered seating in a case method/horseshoe style is preferred.
   c. Bryan Harvey provided a list of buildings/rooms that the faculty selected as the best and worst on campus from the questionnaire. Beyond new construction, the most favorable learning environments were those affected by capital investments. The case method rooms in SOM ranked highest for most favorable. Auditoria in Morrill 2, Bartlett, Hasbrouck, Fernald, and Goessman ranked among the least favorable.

6. Alex presented benchmark data that identified UMass classrooms along with classrooms from Berkley, UConn, BU, and MIT. The NSF per Student FTE was also benchmarked against SCUP data. SCUP identifies an average 7.8 NSF/FTE whereas UMass has roughly 6.2 NSF/FTE, meaning +/- 47,000 NSF less than the SCUP target.

7. Classroom right sizing was discussed. Alex identified that the learning environments tend to be overfilled on average by surpassing their target percent full of between 60 and 70%. Lecture Halls/Auditoria have a target of 70 to 75%, which is also being surpassed. Both put pressure on the existing inventory and scheduling. There is little room for flexibility or overhead to accommodate surplus demand.

8. Another pressure on classroom right sizing is the student station size. Current UMass practice is to provide one student station for every 15 NSF (on average). Modern learning environment design and pedagogy drives a larger student station size. DCAM uses an average of 22 NSF per student station. Alex presented classroom plans that showed the existing condition (15 NSF per student station), an improved layout (roughly 19 NSF), and idealized scenarios (roughly 26-32 NSF, depending on furnishings). This exercise demonstrates that if existing classrooms were right-sized, reduced seat counts would result that would have a significant effect on the existing inventory. New classrooms will need to be built larger to accommodate the same number of students.
9. Alex presented many different room layout types, including ideal rooms for tablet arm chairs, seminar (tables and chairs), lecture, and multi-venue.

10. The overall effect of classroom right-sizing on the existing inventory will be a shift toward rooms with fewer chairs. Density in the inventory will shift toward lower capacity rooms (< 20 and 20-40 seats). This shift presents an opportunity to build new in the larger sizes (60-150 seat rooms).

11. Based on a previous Classroom Vision group meeting, Alex presented the following rooms being considered for taking offline: Fernald 11, Bartlett 65, Morrill II 131, Ag Engineering 119 and 107, Morrill I 129, School of Management 133, Goessman 20, Hasbrouck 20 and 114, and Tolman 24.

12. The question of correct class size was raised. Alex identified that it is a subjective decision based on several factors including enrollments and schedule, and a balance between ideal pedagogy and the realities of available resources.

13. Potential new building programs were presented and discussed. It was agreed that the new building will not be a complete singular answer for the inventory need or to take entire buildings offline, though it is an opportunity to add classroom seats to the inventory and be the catalyst for change across the campus. The potential scenarios presented were as follows:

   a. 100% Classrooms – Large, no departmental space
      1) 8-60 seat, 4-80 seat, 5-100 seat, 4-150 seat, 2-250 seat, 1-400 seat (2800 seats)
      2) Question of logistics – moving that many students in and out effectively everyday
      3) Limited sense of community or campus life

   b. 100% Classrooms – Mix of sizes, no departmental space
      1) 8-35 seat, 8-40 seat, 10-60 seat, 6-80 seat, 2-100 seat, 2-250 seat, 1-400 seat (2780 seats)
      2) Not much difference in seat count, same concerns
      3) Question – Why build more small rooms if right sizing results in a surplus of existing small rooms?
         a) Answers included the ability to replace those small rooms taken offline, repurpose some for other means or departmental space, have a good mix of spaces in the classroom building (which is desirable), etc.

   c. Replace Hills Hall – example of a roughly 40% Classroom/60% Departmental split
      1) 8-60 seat, 4-80 seat, 1-350 seat (1150 seats, not including reduction for those UMass Classroom seats taken offline in Hills)
      2) Does not add much space to the classroom inventory, not too much of a mix
      3) Group identified that adding only one auditorium will not be sufficient to provide additional seats and swing space to renovate existing auditoria

   d. Replace Bartlett Hall – example of a roughly 50/50 split
      1) 2-60 seat, 4-80 seat, 3-100 seat, 2-350 seat (1440 seats, not including reduction for those UMass Classroom seats taken offline in Bartlett)
      2) Susan Personnette identified that a 50/50 split will not be workable. The group agreed that the gain in classroom seats in this example does not do enough to offset the need.

   e. Replace South College – example of a roughly 80/20 split
      1) 12-60 seat, 9-80 seat, 2-150 seat, 1-250 seat, 1-400 seat (2390 seats)
2) Group identified that an 80/20 or 70/30 split should be explored further, since this ratio promotes a significant gain of classroom seats as well as provides a fair amount of space for departmental use.

14. Alex identified several building program goals, including creating a strong learning community and active environment for a successful classroom building. This goal can be achieved by mixing learning environment types, providing departmental anchors, and enhancing student life. The building program must also be matched to its height in order to address logistical issues.

15. Departmental candidates for the new building were discussed. The group identified departmental space needs that cannot be easily addressed in renovation should be considered for the new building. Examples would be in media, arts, and research that have specific space requirements. The group also identified that specialized space in the new building should be able to serve a broad spectrum of the university. Candidate departments that are a good fit with an academic/classroom building will be considered. Alex identified that some specialized space may be expensive to build, which may lead to a reduction in possible classroom area.

16. The department utilization track of the project has met with each department twice. Bryan Harvey asked that the Deans begin to look at what has come out of the departmental meetings to vet the list of needs/deficiencies.

17. During the meeting, several members of the group voiced specific departmental issues as being significant to address in either the new building or the comprehensive plan. These concerns included:
   a. The consolidation of the School of Education, perhaps closer to center campus
   b. More overall space and common areas for Commonwealth College
   c. General consolidation of dispersed departments
   d. SBS consolidation, research, and higher quality specialized space
   e. Anthropology needs space adjacent to academic space

18. Burt Hill asked the group which buildings they felt are a priority to go offline. Jim Cahill identified Hills Hall as the #1 candidate and referenced several backfill options, including using some of the new building space. Jim also identified that Bartlett could remain somewhat longer though significant renovation will become necessary soon.

19. While discussing buildings, the group turned to buildings that could present solutions to space needs in the comprehensive plan. Goodell, Arnold, Dickinson and Furrcola/Marks Meadow were among those identified.
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From: Joel E. Nordberg

February 22, 2009 (revised 12/29/09)

Subject/Project Number: New Academic Classroom Facilities

University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1
Meeting Date: 18 February, 2009
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: UMass Amherst, F&CP

Meeting Purpose:
Site Selection Information Gathering

Attendees: Tom Huf, Jason Vendith, John Matthews, Cleve Carrens, Andy Sloes, Tom Shaw, Pam Rooney, Ludmilla Pavlova – UMA
Ann Storer – DCAM
Jeff Funovits, Joel Nordberg – Burt Hill

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Jeff Funovits, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan

Comments: The meeting was held as a kick-off to gather information about the Campus and begin the process of site selection which will continue with the full Campus Vision Group on 2/27.

1. The Chancellor is committed to elevating the University’s stature academically and through improving the campus.

2. General Building/Site Comments:
   a. A “signature building” is not envisioned.
   b. The character of the new building should compliment the campus and help tie together areas and buildings where they are currently disjointed.
   c. There is no current campus master plan. A comprehensive Master Plan will be started in the fall of 2009.
   d. There is not a favorite site for the new building.
   e. There have been discussions about expanding and renovating or replacing the student union.
   f. It seems likely that the need for multiple new academic buildings will be born out by the Academic Classroom Plan and that considered sites might be prioritized for development according to their contribution to unifying the campus, best value or fitting in to other long term goals.
   g. Existing building survey summaries should identify “liability buildings” - buildings that should not be invested in.
   h. Further focus will be given to advantages and disadvantages of green and brown field site development.
3. Noted campus view sheds and pedestrian paths:
   a. The (obstructed by Bartletts south wing) view to the Connecticut valley from the Library area might be opened or enhanced
   b. The pedestrian path and view from the east residential community that passes down the hill through the Morell complex.
   c. The development plans for the plaza / path to the new student recreation building were reviewed.

4. Campus precincts
   a. The grouping of existing Academic buildings shows a concentration along the west side of the main pedestrian corridor with a leg crossing the campus to the east with the Fine Arts Center, Hills House and the School of Business.
   b. The removal of Hills from the academic inventory due to its condition and physical constraints has been identified as a mid-term objective.
   c. It seems unlikely that a new academic building would be sited in the north or east quadrants which are heavily science and engineering communities.
   d. The concentration of academic space could be effected by backfill opportunities in what have traditionally been science buildings.

5. Utilities:
   a. The map of utilities was reviewed and has been posted on the web site.
   b. Major utility routes (especially steam) were noted along potential sites especially along the tennis court and Isenberg sites.
   c. The inlet and outlets of the pond were explained.
   d. The storm water management capacity of the pond is minimal.
   e. Tunnels from Bartlett to Herter and South College to the Library were also noted.

6. A list of “sacred sites/buildings should be compiled.
   a. The pond green sites may qualify, but more input is needed. This has been a central open space for summer gatherings and music.
   b. Parking sites, such as Lot 62 (north of the Studio Arts Building) have been put forward. Equivalent parking area or structured parking would have to be provided if a current parking site were to be proposed.
   c. The Ganter Field (east of the Boyden Gym) is probably off limits.
   d. Historic preservation priorities need further discussion and direction.

DIEUSIONS OF SPECIFIC SITES
7. Tennis Courts:
   a. The hillside site lends itself to parking under the building. A collaboration would have to be formed with the Building Authority to build the garage portion because DCAM cannot build parking with their funding.
   b. The tennis courts have been under consideration since it was a site for temporary buildings. It was also studied with options for the replacement of the south wing of Bartlett Hall +/- 10 years ago.
   c. The site may be large enough to be considered for a multi-phased development site.

8. Isenberg:
   a. Expansion of Isenberg is not funded.
   b. The maximum development potential of the open space to the east of Isenberg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th>Action By/Due Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is to be established as one of the four sites to be considered in the study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Power Plant:**
   a. Recognized as a prime development site.
   b. Clean-up costs have been estimated at $10 mil., $5 mil. of which would go to abatement.
   c. The site will probably not be available for 2 years and should probably be considered only as a long range site.
   d. Could be a candidate for stimulus money that could bring it into play sooner.

10. **South College:**
    a. Some internal debate exists over whether this is a legacy building, a building for expansion or a site for demolition and reuse.
    b. South College is in a key slot along the main campus pedestrian spine.
    c. Some combination of renovation and addition might be considered.
    d. Demolition of the west wing was also put forth.

11. **Pond Sites:**
    a. Probably a controversial area for development.
    b. The site, south of Bosworth, to the north of the pond, has been identified in the past. The view shed between the Campus Center and Bosworth from the Draper Lab area should probably be preserved, however.
    c. If a site in this area were to be considered it would probably only be appropriate for a signature building.

12. **Other sites:**
    a. The Newman Center is not available.
    b. The fraternity sites along North Pleasant Street could be considered, but are unlikely to become available.
    c. The Monson Annex is scheduled for demolition however the site footprint is small.
    d. “Gap sites” along Massachusetts Avenue should get some consideration.
    e. Playing fields east of Boyd en (world class field hockey / lacrosse field), not likely.
    f. East of the East Experiment Station – probably conflicts with Worcester Dining Hall. It is also out of the general concentration of academic buildings.

13. **Land use analysis (highest and best use) criteria will be used taking into account environmental, parking, circulation, landscape, major trees, historic buildings, etc. will be considered in making recommendations**

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

**BURT HILL**

/s/
Joel E. Nordberg
February 22, 2009 (revised to incorporate Ann Storer’s edits, 12/29/09)
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg

December 15, 2009

Subject/Project Number:
New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Campus Vision Group

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 2/27/09
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: UMass F&CP

Meeting Purpose:
Organize the committee and launch the site selection process for the new academic classroom building.

Attendees:

UMass: Juanita Holler, Joyce Hatch, Bryan Harvey, Jim Cahill, Susan Personette, Pat Daley, Pam Rooney, Ludmilla Pavlova

DCAM: Ann Storer

Burt Hill: Michael Reagan, Jeff Funovits, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
For Record

Comments: 
A project update was presented with the primary focus being on the progress campus analysis and site selection. The Power Point presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.

1. Susan Personette gave introductions.
2. Burt Hill gave an overview of the Academic and Classroom Facilities Plan and the Certifiable Building Study process and current status with the following points and comments recorded:
   2.1.1. Project Schedule with emphasis on selecting the site by June first.
   2.1.2. Building walk thru's were completed and preliminary rankings and the survey and evaluation process was reviewed.
   2.1.3. The classroom evaluation process was outlined.
3. The site selection and campus analysis groundwork was presented (see Power Point).
4. Bryan Harvey noted that a single large building may not be the right solution and that multiple smaller projects should be open for consideration.
5. Burt Hill will study the potential and scale of an addition to the Isenberg School. The fraternity houses to the east of the site would be a desirable add to the site but this has been explored and is very unlikely and should not be considered.
6. Susan Personette noted that a separate library utilization study would be launched in the near future.
7. The Building Study will be started on a generic level. Classroom and special department spaces may influence the layout of the building but generic academic space can be used as a base point.
8. Goodell is a resource that needs to be closely looked at and better utilized.
9. Some buildings, decommissioned science, could become classroom/academic backfill buildings. The Wilson study needs to be overlayed. This should be possible by mid-March.
10. Jim Cahill brought up the need for flexibility in the schedule and the need to stay on an aggressive schedule even if the building study can not launch in June as specified.
11. DCAM expects to start design drawings on the new building in December of 2009.
12. Susan Personette suggested that an early focus be on specific department needs that might affect the new building program. Bryan Harvey asked if this departmental need assessment process can be accelerated to bring more information to the new building program in the pre-June time frame.
13. The classroom study and recommendations will need to be influenced by the direction of the curriculum. Current physical conditions dictate curriculum and instruction delivery. Perhaps a special group should be convened to discuss curriculum and classroom ideals and goals.
14. Susan Personette noted that 4 sites had been identified as of today for further study.
15. South College is a good site but the special attention needed for historical issues may take years to resolve. South College should be excluded from the list of active Certifiable Building Study sites for a first building. South College is a key part of the academic plan however, where renovation/adaptive reuse, additions and façade retention are potential viable long range options.
16. Draper is another potential, desirable site for a new building or major addition but with the same historic complications as South College.
17. Site (campus) development principles need to be stated such as “retaining historical fabric” and “strengthening the academic campus core”.
18. The site analysis needs to include an overlay of where the students area and where major destinations and natural paths occur.
19. Consideration is also needed of what classrooms types are needed in what locations.
20. Lot 62 (the parking lot adjacent to the Studio Arts Building could be considered as part of the academic core.
21. Joyce Holler noted that there is a lack of density on the campus that is a negative in the student experience of moving from building to building through the campus.
22. The Learning Common in the library is a draw and a successful example of a student center. The new recreation center will be a similar draw making the South College area a prime site.
23. Bryan Harvey suggested that views to the west should be emphasized and enhanced, possibly even to the point of removing the north wing of Bartlett.
24. Jim Cahill noted that the original campus was organized around country road-like pathways that largely followed the topography.
25. Susan Personette noted that there is a predominance of buildings on a north south axis and that some east west buildings might be helpful in defining better exterior spaces within existing building clusters.
26. It was generally agreed that the open areas around the pond should be retained as an unobstructed water feature even though there could be an interesting building site along the east side of the pond.
27. The service core along Tobin and Goodell to Thompson and ultimately the Library and Student Union needs to be understood and addressed. Jim Cahill noted that they have a goal to get the mail services out of the Goodell Addition.
28. Andy Soles referenced an existing high pedestrian travel volume between the Library and South College area which will increase with the new Recreation Center. A plan was referenced for a Promenade to the north of Dickinson.
29. As to this being a “signature building”:
   29.1. It was agreed that this will be an important destination building and that it must contribute to the fabric of the campus, engaging the public spaces it touches and not become a monument to design.
   29.2. Susan Personette noted the need for more sense of place (some there, there) and connectivity to other building and site features.
   29.3. Bryan Harvey noted that there may not be other big buildings of this scale in the future. And that due to the high profile from the volume of student that will use the building, its importance must be reflected in the design. It will not be a background building.
   29.4. The building will be a high impact, destination building for students but not for the public.
30. South College, Draper and the tennis Courts site are each high value, target sites. A Draper site could be used to strengthen north south campus connections.
31. The Power Plan site is desirable but the timing and cost for abatement and demolition will not allow for its consideration as a first building site.
32. Ann Storer noted that there would be a benefit to an overlay coordination with the science study.
33. Jim Cahill noted that the Campus Police will be moving out of Dickinson in the December 2010/January 2011 time frame bringing Dickinson into a key role in the academic plan.
34. Joyce Holler noted that South College and Hills both need to be taken out of the inventory due to their condition and functional deficiencies.
35. Bryan Harvey noted that the Marks Meadow school may be closed and could become available for UMass repurposing.
36. Bryan Harvey identified three building program drivers: the need for large auditoria spaces; 80 to 100 seat classrooms; and, more 40 to 50 seat classrooms.
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From: Janeen M. Jaworski April 21, 2009 (revised 12/30/09)

Subject/Project Number: Campus Vision Group

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 3
Meeting Date: April 16, 2009
10:00 to 12:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning, Rm 243

Meeting Purpose:
Campus Vision Group

Attendees:

Provost’s Office – Bryan Harvey, John Cunningham
Admissions & Finance – Juanita Holler
Physical Plant – Patrick Daly
Facilities & Campus Planning – Jim Cahill, Susan Personette, Pam Rooney, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM – Sarah Tindall
Burt Hill – Michael Reagan, Steven Brittan, Jeff Funovits, Dave Linamen, Joel Nordberg, Janeen Jaworski

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Sarah Tindall, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan, David Linamen, Joel Nordberg, Steven Brittan, Jeff Funovits

Comments:

Overview
1. The intention of this meeting was to review the project goals, assumptions and potential site selections for the proposed academic building and possible future buildings.

2. The existing site analysis and potential site options were reviewed and discussed. Potential building locations and building footprints were discussed with the use of a physical model of the existing campus, as provided by Burt, Hill.

3. Discussion included a request for further development of detailed site analysis and revisions to the site selection matrix based on priorities, as specified by UMass. Site selection options were ranked by the Campus Vision group and narrowed down to the top 5 potential site selection options. Burt, Hill will continue to develop the selected options.

Data Gathering
4. Campus goals, assumptions and site analysis of the core campus were reviewed and discussed.

5. The possible location, dimension, gross square footage, and matrix score of each potential building/site selection option was reviewed and discussed.
6. Matrix scores ranged from 0 to 3, 0 indicating the category as a limitation and 3 indicating the category as an opportunity. Scores are based on potential construction time and cost.

7. Scores were totaled and potential sites were ranked.

Campus Goals, Assumptions and Site Analysis Comments
The notes below are a summary of comments from the committee for the benefit of the consulting team.

8. Building Goals
   a. In reference to bullet 5, implications of expansion need to be clear. Phrasing should be “Consider Possible Expansion” (Bryan)
   b. In reference to bullet 6, the Master Plan will include programming (Ludmilla) and this bullet point should be removed. (Susan)

9. Campus Goals
   a. The first building should be minimal in cost; future building costs will need to be re-accessed at another time (Susan)
   b. In reference to bullet 3, selecting the site for an academic building should be considered a high profile project. Phrasing is confusing between “signature building” and “highly visible site”. It was agreed that this bullet point should be removed.
   c. It was discussed that this new building needs to have civic quality. (Bryan)
   d. Consideration should be given to the academic core expanding to the east side of N. Pleasant. Susan questioned if the academic precinct should extend, since it is more likely that they would favor locating the proposed academic building within the current core campus.
   e. The Master Plan should address academic use expanding across N. Pleasant.

10. Site Selection Matrix
    a. The “High Visibility” category was discussed and agreed upon to be removed from the matrix.
    b. It was requested that matrix categories be rephrased from negatives to positives.
    c. It was suggested that consideration be given to creating academic neighborhoods similar to science.
    d. Discussion that there needs to be a category that reflects program analysis (Bryan)
    e. The client will further define their academic goals.

11. Site Analysis
    a. Building Use/Land Use
       1) It was requested that proposed Science buildings be added to the use analysis (Susan)
       2) Whitmore use should be revised accordingly (Ludmilla)
       3) Studio Arts, Fernald, Lot 62 and the area directly south of Lot 62 should be shown as academic.
       4) Recreational use should be expanded to include areas east of Commonwealth Avenue
       5) A category should be added for “Administrative/Support” (Juanita)
    b. Circulation
       1) The area between Herter and Fine Arts should be shown as service (Byran)
       2) Primary and Secondary vehicular paths should be shown (Susan)
       3) Loading access concerns should be considered (Pat)
       4) Infirmary Road should be shown as vehicular (Ludmilla)
    c. Natural Systems
       1) The following viewsheds should be included:
          a) From the Northeast Residential area (Ludmilla)
b) From Hills to campus pond (Bryan)
c) From Fine Arts and beyond into campus (Susan)
d) To the main entrance areas/gateways of campus (southwest, southeast, and northeast)
e) From the visitor’s center to Fine Arts (the most formal view of campus)

2) Arboretum information should be included in the natural systems analysis (Ludmilla)
3) Consideration should be given to modified views once buildings are removed. Views to be preserved should be identified (Bryan)
4) It was acknowledged that views relate to first impressions and that campus entrances need to be enhanced.
5) It was requested that views be categorized by either internal or external.

d. Renovations and Demolitions
   1) The following buildings should be added to the demolition list
      a) Power Plant
      b) Hills
      c) Trailors near South College
      d) University Apartments
      e) Munson Annex
   2) No decision has been made by the University to renovate or demolish South College (Bryan)
   3) Bartlett is questionable (Susan)
   4) The plan view should extend further north to show the School of Education (Ludmilla)
   5) Demolition and renovation should be categorized and colored as “Definate or Questionable” (Juanita)
   6) The fraternities should not be shown as highlighted (Pat), but they should still be on the table (Bryan)
   7) Trying to acquire the land from the fraternities would be a delay (Pat)
   8) Funding for the University Apartment demolition is in place (Susan)

e. Site Ranking
   1) The area adjacent to Whitmore was discussed as a potential site option. This option would require all three existing buildings near Hampshire to be removed (Ludmilla)
   2) It was requested that the University Apartments should be added to the list as a potential site option (Bryan)
   3) It was further clarified that the University Apartments site should be considered possible parking, should Lot 62 is selected for a new building (Patrick)

Potential Site Selection Comments
The notes below are a summary of comments from the committee for the benefit of the consulting team.

12. Tennis Court Option A1
   a. Jeff clarified that the grading/vertical transition provides a challenge in regards to pedestrian and vehicular access. Fill will be necessary and the viewshed from campus would be closed off.
   b. This option would provide views from the building to the west (Susan)
   c. There should be further review of whether the viewshed from campus to the valley can be maintained (Ludmilla)

13. Isenberg
   a. A 5 to 6-story proposed building did not appear to be offensive in size when viewed in context (Bryan), but concern was expressed that the proposed building would block Mahar (Ludmilla)
   b. One suggestion was to move the building north, block the service road, make the building longer and extend walkway (Susan)
   c. It was commented that management will need to be expanded (students, faculty and general increase) at some point in time (Bryan)
   d. Program space from Fine Arts could expand into a new building (Bryan)
e. Long range plans for fraternities should be analyzed, if Isenbert was built (Susan)

14. South College
   a. There was general agreement that Option C2 was liked. However, it should reinforce the existing circulation (Susan)
   b. In terms of constructability, the existing South College building could remain while the proposed building was constructed, with the intention that South College would be demolished once the new building was inhabited (Juanita)
   c. Machmer should be added to the potential demo/renovation list and possibly be considered a site (Bryan)

15. Area East of Student Union
   a. It was recommended that courtyard student spacing be further developed (Juanita) and that consideration be given to revising the building footprint to take the shape of an U or L-shaped building (Susan)
   b. It was clarified that the building footprint shown is 200’x200’ and 160,000 gross sf with 4-stories.
   c. Outdoor space utilization issues with the Union should be analyzed (Juanita)
   d. Another potential option is to fill in the plaza space (Jeff)

16. Draper Hall
   a. Building an addition would be problematic with the current program. It was recommended that the new building which would anchor the north/south axis (Jeff)
   b. The option to retain the existing building while remodeling only the facade and constructing the new building was favored. This option could also address the dead circulation zone in front of Draper (Bryan)
   c. It was unsure if Draper is considered to be historical (Juanita/Bryan)

17. Lot 62
   a. Concern was expressed regarding the addition of mass development to the southeast end of campus (Bryan)
   b. This option does not strengthen the core (Susan), but is does reinforce the Fine Arts area (Bryan) and finishes the quad (Susan)
   c. Discussion took place considering that the core is now shifting to the eastern end of campus
   d. It was also discussed that this option provides a nice transition to the science area and does not appear to be massive looking (Pat)
   e. Proposed building could be gateway building (Bryan)
   f. Lot 62 is considered a valuable parking lot (Juanita)
   g. University Apartments could turn into parking. However, the location at such a formal entry is not desirable (Susan)
   h. Another option that includes new buildings at both the Isenberg and Lot 62 sites was discussed (Susan)
   i. It was also questioned if the proposed building should be placed at the end of Massachusetts Avenue (Juanita) and then acknowledged that that specific location should be reserved for a Signature Building (Susan)
   j. Concern was expressed that should the building be located on Lot 62, then more services will be required, as core moves east across North Pleasant street (Juanita)

18. Power Plant
   a. It was agreed by all that this option is only intended as a future site.

19. Whitmore
   a. Concern was expressed that Whitmore may present a controversy with parking (Juanita). It may be possible to move Whitmore parking south of Massachusetts Avenue or to University Apartments (Susan)
   b. Some had concern for shuttle service (Pat)
   c. The Whitmore site provides the opportunity to create a more formal entrance/entrance point (Steven)
d. One option may be to locate the building in an L-Shape and move parking to the rear (Steven)
e. Concern for student traffic students was expressed and it was indicated that students should use the pedestrian underpass (Juanita)
f. Another option may be to demolish Middlesex, Berkshire, and Hampshire and construct the building in an L-Shape. This would provide the opportunity to strengthen the path to the Recreation Center (Juanita)
g. This location could potentially work for locating a New Dormitory in the future (Susan)
h. The Master Plan should focus on providing space for admissions, possibly provide an addition to the visitor’s center (Ludmilla)

20. Site Selection Matrix
a. It was discussed that Lot 62 option moves higher, if core expands to the east (Jeff)
b. The weight of each category should be re-evaluated (Susan)
c. Specific category discussion was as follows:
   1) Future development should be considered not very important (Bryan)
   2) It was unclear what was meant by demolition or renovation (Juanita). Jeff offered clarification that this was in respect to the associated cost.
   3) There was a recommendation to include a “swing space requirement factor” (Byran). However, if no demolition is required, then swing space should not be a problem (Susan).
   4) It was requested that the “Future development” category be removed (Susan)
      a) More buildings are better than bigger buildings (Susan)
   5) The “Specimen tree” category was also discussed
      a) It was determined that this category remain in the matrix, but be given a low rating. Trees should still be considered very important. (Juanita and Ludmilla)

d. Top 4 high priority categories, as chosen by the group include:
   1) No building demolition
   2) Strengthen academic core
   3) Meets program with appropriate massing
   4) Pad Site
e. Primary/Secondary Options were discussed
   1) The following should be primary:
      a) Campus fabric (Susan)
   2) The following should be secondary:
      a) Viewshed (Susan)
      b) Desirable solar orientation (Juanita)
      c) Specimen trees (Pam)
         (1) It should be acknowledged that there are Japanese elm in front of South College (Pam)
         (2) Species should be the true consideration – Juanita
   3) General Comments:
      a) Pad ready should be separate from parking and should be a deal breaker or a 2 (Susan)
      b) Rename “Consideration of Specimen Trees and Natural Features” (Bryan)
      c) Turn categories into Positive, ie “Preservation of Specimen Trees” (Michael)

f. Other Considerations
   1) Jeff summarized the presentation and opened the discussion
   2) It was questioned if program requirements permit the Tennis courts/buried space to be developed without a negative effect (Juanita).
   3) It was discussed that the building could provide accessibility between levels (from parking to main walk and to other side of Bartlett) (Ludmilla)
   4) The preferred options were discussed
a) Tennis (curved building option) (Susan)
b) South College (#1), Lot 62 (#2) and Draper Option (new building and renovated Draper Façade; #3) (Bryan)
c) Draper, South College, and Whitmore (Juanita)
d) Densities, adjacency, and massing analysis should be further reviewed (Susan)
e) It was questioned if Hills were to be removed, where should people be relocated (Bryan)
f) Michael brought up density and methods of how to measure it for discussion.
   (1) It should be measured by student and Faculty (Bryan)
   (2) Density should be balanced (Susan)
g) South College and Draper sites provide opportunity to address current campus issues (Bryan)
h) South College and Draper should be demolished (John)
i) Schedule is a concern (Ludmilla)

g. Final Site Selection Locations for further review include:
   1) Whitmore Area
   2) Lot 62
   3) South College
   4) Draper
   5) Tennis Courts

Scheduling
21. Next meeting will be May 7th
   a. Campus Vision will review the top 5 sites
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Physical Plant – Patrick Daly Michael Reagan, David
Facilities & Campus Planning – Susan Personette, Pam Linamen, Steve Brittan, Joel
Rooney, Ludmilla Pavlova, Andy Soles, Joyce Hatch, Cleve Nordberg, Jeff Funovits
Carrens
DCAM – Ann Storer
Burt Hill – Michael Reagan, Steve Brittan, Jeff Funovits,
Alex Wing, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg, Janeen Jaworski

Comments:

Overview
1. The intention of this meeting was to review the previous meeting, the updated site analysis, and the revised site options for immediate and long range planning.
2. Potential options for future expansion of the Isenberg School of Management were also discussed and an update on the Information Gathering and Analysis report was given.
3. The meeting ended with a discussion and compilation of a short list of sites for the proposed academic building.
4. It was requested that the Metawampe site be added to the potential site list and re-evaluated.
5. Burt, Hill will further evaluate each of the noted sites and include that information in the form of a report.

Data Gathering
6. Revised campus goals, assumptions and site analysis of the core campus and the area directly east of the core campus were reviewed and discussed.
7. The possible location, dimension, gross square footage, and matrix score of each revised potential building/site selection option was reviewed and discussed.
8. Matrix scores ranged from 0 to 3, 0 indicating the category as a limitation and 3 indicating the category as an
opportunity. Scores are based on potential construction time and cost.

9. Scores were totaled and potential sites were ranked.

Campus Goals, Assumptions and Site Analysis Comments
The notes below are a summary of comments from the committee for the benefit of the consulting team.

10. Guiding Principles/Building Goals/Campus Goals
a. General discussion resulted in the consensus that the phrasing of the principles and goals need to be reviewed and revised as a collaborative effort between the Campus Vision group and the consulting team.

11. Site Selection Matrix
a. “Student Life” category should be added (Juanita)
b. Discussion of proposed building impact on existing parking
   1) Ann to verify if DCAM can or cannot build/finance proposed surface and/or structure parking
   2) The cost of relocated parking incurred on University should be analyzed (Juanita)
c. Site sustainability is too broad and should be rephrased to include additional sustainability variables (ie stormwater management) (Susan)
d. Accessible transportation and access should be analyzed and added to sustainability (Ann)
e. Viewsheds should account for viewsheds from existing buildings and the impact of proposed building placement (Ludmilla)
f. “Enhance campus fabric” is too general (Susan)
g. “Possible future expansion” should be added to the matrix (Susan)
h. Discussion took place questioning if the matrix should be expanded to focus on the comprehensive plan
   1) Bryan commented that there should be two versions of the matrix, one for the proposed building and one for the comprehensive plan

12. Site Analysis
a. Building Use/Land Use
   1) Include School of Education site on presentation plans. (Juanita)
   2) Pedestrian mall should show as green space (Juanita)
   3) Jeff clarified that land use as shown in the presentation portrays the space in regards to districts and questioned if there should be a land use diagram and a district diagram
   4) The general consensus was that there should be 2 separate slides: one for land use and one for district use
   5) Should the “Academic” category be expanded to include separate disciplines, ie Psychology, arts, science, etc. (Ann)

b. Circulation
   1) Circulation should be added to the district plan (Bryan)
   2) Densities of pedestrian flow and commuter traffic should be reviewed (Bryan)

c. Natural Systems
   1) General discussion of viewsheds and the impact of viewsheds on the proposed site took place
   2) It was commented that viewsheds should not be a limiting factor
   3) Steve Brittan commented that the Whitmore site is a gateway view into campus.

d. Topography
   1) No comments
e. Renovations and Demolitions
   1) Jeff clarified that colors, as shown, correlate with Joel’s slides regarding building condition

f. Classroom Density Slide
   1) Alex presented the slide as concentrations of classrooms and correlation to seating
   2) There is a concentration of classrooms in the west and southwest area of the campus. (Steve)
   3) There is a concentration of students to the East (Bryan)
   4) Jeff questioned if the goal is to concentrate or distribute academic use across campus
   5) A general client comment was that the consultant should take into account the student point of view and that they like to see and be seen in comfortable safe areas. The question was posed as to how the campus is made to feel alive.
   6) Bryan commented that the review the Metawampe site should be re-evaluated for siting the proposed building. It would be a major destination site and it would provide the opportunity to modify the north end of the Pond.
   7) The proposed site could incorporate a greenroof (Ludmilla)

g. Previous Concept Summary
   1) No comments

Potential Site Selection Comments
The notes below are a summary of comments from the committee for the benefit of the consulting team.

13. Whitmore
   a. This location does not add to campus life, increases pedestrian traffic across Commonwealth Avenue and concentrates students near a residential area. It is not a good location for an academic building. (Susan)
   b. It is important that phased options be reviewed and analyzed as to whether or not the compilation of Phase 1 and 2 proposed development works for the proposed location as a whole (Alex)
   c. This site should be considered for long term development in the Master Plan study.
   d. A large number of students would spend the majority of their time in the southwest campus due to the proximity to housing.
   e. Consideration should be expanded to include the Hampshire, Berkshire and Middlesex buildings.

14. Lot 62
   a. This should be an important site to be developed, but not as critical a site as the student union. It is too far from the Center of the Campus (Susan)
   b. There is a need to be cautious about circulation/pedestrian crossings across North Pleasant Street. This may be too close to Residential Halls which may result in less use of the core campus across N. Pleasant
   c. Proposed building should incorporate structured parking either on the site or near by. (Juanita)
   d. Consultant should review proposed building based on Stockbridge study.
   e. The greenhouse behind French is to be demolished and replaced at Bowditch in a separate project. (Ann)
   f. Alternative parking will need to be provided for the Studio Arts and other buildings currently served by Lot 62. (Juanita)
   g. It should be noted that Lot 62 is considered one of the most valuable parking lots on campus.
   h. This site should still be considered as a potential option for siting the proposed academic building due to its characteristics as a pad ready site and the potential to expand the core campus across N. Pleasant Street.

15. South College
   a. It was commented that perhaps the Student Union should be rebuilt on the South College site.
b. This site should be considered a long term option due to its status as a legacy building and the required time to make an informed decision regarding the renovation or demolition of the existing building.

16. Draper Hall
   a. A large size of the proposed building negates the existing adjacent courtyard (Susan)
   b. All proposed science buildings should be shown on the physical model and included in the analysis slides (Susan)
   c. The Student Union’s future is unknown.
   d. It was requested that the area adjacent to the student union be reviewed for possible development (Susan)
   e. The Student Union site is an identifiable space which would provide an anchor for that area of campus (Alex)
   f. It could be a great location for a signature building (Steve)
   g. A proposed building would lessen the impact of the Campus Center (Juanita)
   h. Draper option should be reviewed if there is an opportunity to connect to underground Campus Center tunnel
   i. This site should be considered as a long term development option due to its location adjacent to the science and engineering districts and the potential to locate a proposed science building nearby.

17. Tennis Courts
   a. Administration should be moved from Goodell to an off-site location. Then if Tennis Court area were to be developed there would be more correlation to Goodell (Ludmilla)
   b. It should be reviewed as to whether or not a bridge should be provided between the proposed building and Goodell. (Ludmilla)
   c. Many felt the location pushes classrooms too far from the campus core but that the site should continue to be considered as a potential site for the proposed academic building.

18. Isenberg School of Management
   a. Burt Hill should suggest an addition with a footprint similar to one of the 3 floor plates proposed at Lot 62
   b. This site should be considered for future expansion/development specifically for the Isenberg School of Management due to its proximity to the existing building.

General Comments
1. Additional site criteria should include making the campus feel alive. Enhances/reinforces pedestrian flow. First phase should make as large an impact as possible (Susan)
2. The opportunity to connect to other campus buildings with similar functions, ie “complimentary neighbors” should be further evaluated
3. Long term options should consider the removal of South College and Bartlett (Bryan)
4. The urban design possibilities of the pond site could out-way the potential cost
5. Campus vision group should reconvene one week later to discuss site selection option (Susan)
6. Burt Hill should explore multiple massing options for relating to the surrounding buildings at the Pond Site.
7. Building height, as shown in the physical model should generally range from low, mid to high rise.
8. Burt Hill needs to review physical model for accuracy (Susan)
9. Burt Hill commented that the model was meant to be a study model and that the existing building heights will be modified, as requested.
10. The general consensus was that the 3 preferred sites include (in no particular order) Lot 62, the Tennis court site and the site adjacent to the Student Union
11. A meeting should be setup to brief the Chancellor of site selection progress for May 19th. The meeting should be a briefing of the potential sites (Ann)

Scheduling
10. Next Meeting will be May 14th
   a. Campus Vision will review the top 3 potential sites for the proposed academic building.
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Comments: The Power Point presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to
the UMass Share Site for reference. The focus of the meeting was to review the top potential sites for the New
Academic Building.

Overview

1. The intention of this meeting was to review the revised project principles and goals and the top three potential
sites for the proposed academic building.
2. Discussion included previous options for the Tennis Court and Lot 62 options, as well as, six developmental
study sketches and an analysis of the pond site.
3. The committee discussed previous studies that included the pond as an option and the challenges that may
come with the pond site. Burt Hill was requested to further develop the pond option based on geotechnical
information and state/local regulations.

Data Gathering

4. Project principles and goals were reviewed and discussed. The committee asked that Burt Hill revise the wording
as noted below.
5. The possible location, dimensions, gross square footage, opportunities and constraints were discussed regarding the top three potential sites and the developmental pond studies.

Project Component and Site Analysis Comments
The notes below are a summary of comments from the committee for the benefit of the consulting team.

6. Project Components – Susan and Ludmilla collaborated with Burt Hill to refine the list of project components. Planning principles were based on campus standards. Project components are a first round draft and are open for discussion and can be revised, as necessary. Steve asked that the Campus Vision group discuss each site by testing it against the project components. The following is a summary of those project components:
   a. Campus Planning Principles
      1) Site selection should maximize positive impact on the campus image, sense of place, and functionality
      2) Provide a variety of spaces for intellectual and social interaction, both large and small scale
      3) Architecture should respect historical campus context and increase spatial coherence of the campus
      4) Meet the functional needs of the users
      5) Construct sustainable buildings in respect to cost and ecology
      6) Design for programmatic and spatial flexibility over time
      7) Build for permanence
      8) In addition to the components listed in the slide, Susan clarified the following:
         a) The new building should not be a signature building
         b) The new development option needs to provide flexibility over time
         c) UMASS staff members requested that the word flexibility removed and replaced with adaptability (over time)
   b. Site Planning Goals
      1) Civic – Positive interaction with existing buildings, spaces and programs.
      2) Lively – Concentration of student activity close to existing student magnets
      3) Coherent – Creation and reinforcement of a coherent spatial structure on campus
   c. Building Design Goals
      1) Civic – Enhance existing campus fabric with a new civic building
      2) Active – Create a major programmatic destination and hub of student activity
      3) Interactive – Create multiple opportunities for formal/informal intellectual and social interaction
      4) Sustainable – Integrate sustainable building/site design and practices
      5) High-tech – Provide high-tech learning environments

7. Site Analysis
   a. Classroom Analysis (as depicted in an animation)
      The Campus Vision group reviewed an animation which diagrammed seats occupied by hour. Dots ranged in size based on the number of people using the room at a given time. Dots ranged in color from green to light red to red. Green indicated buildings under capacity, light red indicated buildings at low capacity and red indicated buildings over capacity.
      1) It was clarified that the classroom analysis was based on scheduled classes.
      2) Lot 62 and the Tennis court option complete the loop of classroom usage while the Metawampe site reinforces use within the academic core. The center should be reinforced (Susan)
      3) Michael commented that the tennis court option may make sense in respect to Bartlett coming off-line in the near future
4) Susan referred to Jane Jacobs’ urban design study and commented that adding mixed uses 
only further enhances the student experience
5) Draper does not work due to the constraints of the surrounding buildings and the scale of the 
new building which would be too large next to Draper.
6) The Draper site would be viable if the existing Draper building were to be removed but this 
would be unlikely.
7) The potential building size for the South College site does not permit the siting of an academic 
building (Ann)
8) Potential future building sites should not discount further consideration of the tennis court 
option (Juanita)
9) Each site offers the potential for a different type of activity center (Juanita)
10) Service issues should be re-evaluated for the Metawampe and Tennis court sites, specifically 
the effect of the mail room adjacent to the Tennis court site (Ludmilla)

Potential Site Selection Comments
The Site Presentation by Burt Hill began with the potential site summary slide. It was clarified that those areas highlighted 
in green indicated a current use of open space and those highlighted in blue indicated a current use of parking.

The top three potential sites were then presented to the committee. Those sites included the Metawampe site, Lot 62 and 
the Tennis Courts.

The notes below are a summary of comments from the committee for the benefit of the consulting team.

8. Metawampe Site
A total of six developmental study options were presented as follows:

a. Developmental Study Option 1
1) This option respects the edge of Hasbrouck and proposed an L-shaped building crossing the 
main north-south walkway and draws the pond into the building creating a continuity of water 
2) Susan agreed that this would provide a great opportunity to have a tangible relationship with 
the water 
3) It was mentioned that a previous study separate from Burt Hill’s proposed developing this area, 
but proposed moving the building east of the Pond due to water issues. The Chancellor later 
cancelled that option

b. Developmental Study Option 2
1) This option proposed the building in an L Shape, with the L oriented towards the existing 
student union building. 
2) It would connect to and enhance the existing campus center stairs. 
3) The Metawampe statue would be relocated further east between the newly proposed building 
and the Student Union building. 
4) Reconnections to surrounding existing buildings would need to be re-evaluated. 
5) The importance of building entrance locations was stressed. 
6) Steve clarified that the student use area would be at the ground floor level. 
7) Consideration should be given to incorporating an outdoor café space (Susan).

c. Developmental Study Option 3
1) This option showed the building parallel to the east-west main walkway and included a gazebo 
which would extend past the existing edge of the pond
2) This option would reinforce the existing circulation and provide a landscape feature between the rear of the proposed building and the existing campus center steps.

3) Cost to incorporate waterscape should be further evaluated and a smaller water feature, such as a fountain should be considered (Susan).

4) Three aerators are slated to be installed in the existing pond (Susan).

5) It was discussed that there have been previous conversations between various UMass staff members as to whether or not the pond should be dredged due to the sediment build-up on the bottom of pond site.

6) UMass is working with the city of Amherst to receive a grant to study the upstream source of the pond.

d. Developmental Study Option 4
   1) This option proposed a building parallel with the east-west walkway and proposed a cantilevered auditorium which would extend over the existing pond.
   2) The entire building would range from 4 to 5 stories in height.

e. Developmental Study Option 5
   1) This option proposes a building parallel with the east-west walkway.
   2) The Metawampe statue would be relocated between the proposed building and the existing student union building.
   3) The building itself would be a double loaded corridor, which would break the building down into spaces.
   4) The greenspace between the proposed building and the existing campus center would be further enhanced.

f. Developmental Study Option 6 (preferred option)
   1) The proposed building would be oriented parallel to the east-west walk.
   2) Service areas would be screened and the building would not have a specific front or back.
   3) The proposed building would be 4-stories high and could include a buried auditorium.
   4) The Metawampe statue would be relocated between the proposed building and the existing student union.
   5) Susan liked the positive feeling of the open space and garden, as it would create a positive feel.
   6) Building shadows would need to be evaluated/reviewed (Susan).
   7) This option proposed a smaller more intimate auditorium as an extension of the proposed building. The auditorium would be located between the proposed building and the campus center steps.
   8) Susan was concerned that the building as a whole would be too large in the open space and that this would not provide enough space for outdoor activities.
   9) Juanita commented that perhaps the space could be terraced and open.
   10) Ben clarified that the auditorium could be a pavilion element.
   11) Ludmilla commented that there needs to be 2 levels of analysis: building level and campus level.

Analysis of Developmental Option 6 was reviewed and discussed as follows:

a) An existing 72" Drainage Pipe cuts diagonally across the Campus Center green
   (1) Ann questioned if the conduit could be lowered or encased at it’s existing grade.
   (2) Steve clarified that it is a matter of cost.
   (3) Bryan requested that it be evaluated if the proposed building should be reoriented East of the pond area in the existing dead space.
   (4) The original intention was to make more of a connection to the student union (Steve).
   (5) Susan commented that we should present 3 options for the Chancellor’s review and for the certifiable building study.
(6) It was requested by Ann that more people way in on the cost of this option
(7) It was discussed that in a previous study separate from the Burt Hill study it became a challenge to connect space with Hasbrouck, add positive space and address the grade change
(8) Susan commented that the site should be expanded to the south in order to align with the main pedestrian path between Morrill
(9) A copy of the Bruce Wood design/analysis will be distributed to Burt, Hill (Susan)
(10) Steve commented that the building could be lowered as it extends southeast of the pond
(11) Bryan and Susan commented that the internal building circulation is very important and should be studied further
(12) Important of material coherence between the building and the site was stressed
(13) The arrival point of the new building should be at grade with the existing main walkway due to the existing geotech and drainage information
(14) Susan commented that the current green site is dead space due to the sunken grade and the marsh like character of the site

b) Miscellaneous
(1) Geotech should be done for entire Metawampe site (Ludmilla). Burt Hill will identify where the footprint for the geotech survey should be (Steve)
(2) The Metawampe site needs to be evaluated in respect to massing, cost, geotechnical information, and the conservation commission (Susan)
(3) The required buffer of the pond should be taken into account for potential development options (Susan)
(4) All development near the pond needs to go through the Conservation Commission
(5) The Conservation Commission issue will most likely cause a delay (Steve)
(6) A meeting would need to take place with the Conservation Commission to review development of the Metawampe site
(7) UMass staff indicated that a stormwater study is currently in progress
(8) Potential deal-breakers for this site include utilities, geotech, DEP and conservation district, all due to time (Susan)
(9) Steve questioned if the Metawampe site should still be considered due to time and lack of available study information

9. Lot 62
a. The Lot 62 site should be evaluated in respect to the Stockbridge Master Plan

10. Tennis Courts
a. Steve commented that a section would be provided
b. It was noted by the group that this site is valuable for future development of a large scale.
c. Bryan commented that Alex’s diagram of how people are dispersed (by classrooms) throughout campus should be incorporated in the slides
d. The Tennis Courts should be re-evaluated in respect to the viewshed (Bryan)
e. Bartlett may be removed in the future and it should be evaluated how the site should reflect the potential future building removal (Bryan)
f. Michael clarified that the proposed building orientation as shown is sustainable

g. The proposed building reinforces the new Rec Center Design (Susan)

h. The proposed building seems to lend itself to another use, other than academic (Ann)

i. 7 stories does not support academic use (Susan)

j. It was then discussed if the building should be in an L-Shape, which would reduce building height. This orientation was eliminated due to the concern of blocking the current viewshed from the core campus to the west

k. Susan commented that this site fails in respect to the liveliness criteria

l. One risk with this site is that this side of campus has not been master planned (Susan)

General Comments
1. Susan commented that the matrix needs to be revised based on the refined Project Components
2. It was commented that the open space surrounding the pond should be preserved for the foreseeable future and that its potential should be maximized based on the boundary lines, as discussed earlier
3. Michael commented that the Metawampe site should be eliminated as a possible geothermal source and Susan agreed
4. Skinner Hall students collect and sit in front of classroom instead of the gathering spaces at the ends/knuckles of the building (Ann)
5. Burt Hill should show positives and negatives of existing spaces
6. The campus center and the library are not considered civic buildings due to empty space/lack of usage (Susan)
7. The Committee discussed the upcoming May 28th meeting and provided the following comments:
   a. Detailed site selection options should be presented
   b. Each site should receive the same level of diagrams for the Chancellor meeting and analysis diagrams should be presented first
   c. Potential site selections should be ranked
   d. Each potential site selection option should include the matrix and a list of pros and cons (Susan)

Scheduling
1. Future Meetings will be as follows:
   m. May 19, 2009
      1) Short meeting with the Chancellor to present overview of options and 3 sites to be further evaluated (expected to be approximately 30 minutes in length)
   n. May 27, 2009
      1) Meeting with the Campus, Academic, and Classroom Vision groups to review site selection options and prepare for Chancellor’s meeting on May 28th
   o. May 28, 2009
      1) Meeting with the Chancellor to present the three potential sites for the proposed academic building
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From: Benjamin Kou / Joel E. Nordberg, AIA

December 22, 2009

Subject/Project Number: Campus Vision Group

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 6
Meeting Date: 5/27/09 (10:30 – 12:00)
Project Phase: ST02
Meeting Location: F&CP Rm 432

Meeting Purpose:
Site Selection

Attendees: Distribution:
UMass: John Lenzi, Bryan Harvey
Tony Butterfield, Joel Martin, Meredith Lind, Ted Djafferis, Christine McCormack, Terry Warner,
Stephen Burns, Steve Goodwin,
Jim Cahill, Susan Personette, Pam Rooney,
Ludmilla Pavlova, Cleve Carrens, Dan McCahecy, Andy Soles
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Steve Brittan, Joel Nordberg

DCAM: Ann Storer

Burt Hill: Steven Brittan, Ben Kou, Carol Harris, Joel Nordberg, Michael Reagan

Comments: Handouts of the power point presentation were distributed at the meeting and have been posted to the UMass ShareSite.

Pre Meeting (Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova, Ann Storer, Michael Reagan, Ben Kou, Joel Nordberg, Steven Brittan)
A run-through of the presentation was done with edits made to the power point.
A. The revised model was presented to the team outlining the nine sites of study
B. The design metrics in the PPT was presented by SB and pulled for the final PPT to the Group to be unbiased.
C. The PPT also contained a video on designing for student learning and development.
D. Susan & Ann noted that we are doing two things:
   a. Picking the site for this building;
   b. And, identifying future sites that may come into play in the comprehensive plan.
E. Susan noted that the site selection must be a group decision and not be predetermined by the project team.
F. M Regan asked if lot 62 has been determined to be a science building site? Susan felt that the site should still be considered as an option.
G. The Campus Planning Principals / Site planning goals previously revised with Susan and Lu were reviewed without further edit
H. 7 preliminary sites have been narrowed to 4 finalists:
   a. Lot 62 discussion
i. Susan says objected to having a parking lot behind the new proposed building.
ii. Susan expected to see pros and cons listed for the sites. Burt Hill assumed that these lists were best generated in discussions with the Vision group.

b. Tennis courts
i. Susan raised concerns about future long range development

c. Whitmore Site
i. Ann noted that Whitmore is thought to not be an appropriate site for an academic building.
ii. Steve said that the site has merit and it should be considered until a strong front runner emerges

d. East Pond (wetlands discussion)

i. Susan preferred that only the setback lines be shown in the future.
ii. Burt Hill was also directed to study the North Pond site along with the East Pond site until it is definitively determined that it is not viable.

Meeting

1. Introduction (Susan):
   1.1. Need to bring the group together on the site selection recommendation prior to the upcoming EOC meeting.
   1.2. 4 sites are now under consideration, with the hope that in the course of today’s meeting the list will be narrowed down to two sites for the presentation to the Chancellor.

2. SB lead the PPT presentation which included the design metrics, video, and decision making matrix.

3. 7 sites have been reviewed in prior meetings with the focus now on 4 for the CBS. The other sites are viable, however, and should be considered for future uses.

4. Lot 62’s:
   4.1. North south orientation was questioned by Brian? Steve felt that the north south axis of North Pleasant Street is very important and dictates the primary axis of the building.
   4.2. Susan noted that Lot 62 presents a one time opportunity for an arts building in the arts district that could be lost if developed for other programs. It would also be a good site for Landscape Architecture.
   4.3. The design of the building to be flexibility and expandable was discussed. Bryan Harvey questioned whether we would really want the building to get any bigger than 150,000sf.
   4.4. Adaptability within the building was more important to Jim.
   4.5. Lu’s concern was not so much for the flexibility and expansion of the building but precluding the use of the site for a higher, future use in the comprehensive plan.
   4.6. A large number of parking spaces would be displaced in developing the site.

5. Tennis Courts:
   5.1. An overview of the site, circulation flow and massing was reviewed in the decision matrix.
   5.2. S Burns noted that the pedestrian flow is terrible around the tennis court area of the campus. With no natural paths, the exiting flow needs to be looked at very closely to find patterns to build from.
   5.3. JC - Tobin doesn’t work well from a campus planning sense and the same approach should not be repeated.
   5.4. Brian also noted that Tobin and the areas around it are confusing.

6. Whitmore:
   6.1. Agreed to be a better future site for another building type.
   6.2. The site could contribute in defining a gateway area for the campus.
   6.3. The site could support an even larger iconic building.
   6.4. The concern over displacing a great deal of parking was also noted.

7. East Pond Site:
   7.1. The center campus location and proximity to other student activities is very desirable.
   7.2. The process for building within a regulated wetland and the impact on the schedule is a major concern.
   7.3. Any excavation within a set back or buffer zone will trigger the environmental review.
   7.4. The “order of conditions” for building in a buffer zone needs to be investigated and better understood.
   7.5. Brian felt that the building should wrap around the north and east sides of the pond.
7.6. Bryan also noted that obstructing the view of the pond when headed south on North Pleasant Street is not a significant issue in that now the pond views are blocked by trees.
7.7. Summer use of the building in conjunction with the Campus Center hotel and meeting facilities open additional great opportunities.
7.8. Ann questioned what a reasonable time period was to investigate the site and conservation restrictions.
7.9. Susan recommended that serious conversation should begin with the Amherst Conservation Commission to get a sense of what their position and opinions on the site might be.

General Discussion:

8. The people who park at Lot 62 will need to be heard from if that site is to receive serious further consideration. It was a strong second choice, however.
9. A question was raised regarding the status of the Draper site with the explanation that it was not under consideration for the NACB because of historic complications with Draper Hall, the scale of the site, and its location outside of the central academic campus core.
10. Building options were looked at using the updated site model. Corrections to the model were received well.
11. Discussion took place as to how the sites address and fit the civic and campus design principles and goals.
12. Straw Rankings
   12.1. First - Pond Site
   12.2. Second - Lot 62 Site
   12.3. Third - Tennis Courts
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Subject/Project Number: Team Meeting
   (Site Selection)

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
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Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:

12 June 2009 Site Selection UMass

Meeting Purpose:

Review of 3 Selected Site Options in Preparation for the Upcoming Academic/Campus Vision Group Meeting

Attendees:

UMass Juanita Holler (JH), Brian Harvey (BrH)
   Susan Personette (SP), Ludmilla Pavlova (LP)
   Jim Cahill (JC), Pam Rooney (PR) – Facilities
   Planning
   Pat Daley (PD), John Matthews (JM) – Facilities
DCAM Ann Storer (AS), Ron Ferrara (RF) (by phone)
JNEI Sandra Brock (SBk)
BH Steve Brittan (SBr), Joel Nordberg (JN)

Distribution:

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing,
Michael Reagan, Steve Brittan, Joel Nordberg

Comments:

The Power Point presentation of the meeting has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference. The focus of the meeting was to review the top potential sites for the New Academic Building.

1. Analysis Summary:
   a. Site diagrams have been coordinated according to use categories so that colors are coded on plans and site sections in each of the developed studies.
   b. The ranking matrix will be taken off the presentation. Pros and Cons for each site will be presented but the rankings and recommendations should come from the University.

   BH
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th>Action By/Due Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. North Pond Site:</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The East West pedestrian lane lines should be changed to indicate a solid line for a primary path.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A Memorandum of Agreement process with MHC could be shaped and filed separately and before the environmental filings. There is no current historic district on the campus. EYP has recommended the Pond area be a district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EYP is putting together all of their reports on all buildings over 50 years old including the pond area. Facilities and Planning are currently reviewing their profiles and will request amendments before filings with MHC are formalized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. JC – The review process should be started with MHC as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. A conservation plan for the pond has been identified as a component of the Master Plan in the RFP. A reiteration was made that this is a big issue with Amherst Conservation Commission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. There is a historically sensitive masonry outlet structure that is also structurally questionable in the area of the building site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The massing diagrams indicated consideration for 2, 250 seat auditoria in footprint.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Strong associations are emphasized with the Student Union, Campus Center and Hasbrouck in the “sphere” immediately around the new building site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. BrH pointed out that a primary pedestrian path of travel exists along a diagonal, toward the Southwest through the site, connecting the path along the east of the Campus Center with the pathway along the west side of the pond.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The building is placed to protect views from the Campus Center and to frame views of the Campus Center. The height also takes into account the scale of the Student Union.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Space between the CC and the new building might be an amphitheater type outdoor space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. An overhang on the pond side of the building could be developed with a food court and seating area facing the pond.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. JM the walkway is on what is actually an earthen dike or dam. It may be possible to direct run-off away from the pond.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. SBk stated that a waterway that moves through a culvert for more than 200 ft is not defined as a stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The designation of the water body between where the culvert comes into the pond on the south and goes back underground at the north needs to be established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The culvert daylights farther to the northwest, below the hockey practice rink and becomes Tan Brook, a perennial stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) An interpretation could be made that the pond is actually a river however it was thought that it has been designated as a pond which also seems consistent with CMR definitions. 

o. If designated a pond the delineation line along the north end of the pond would be perpendicular to where the stream goes underground.

3. Filing Process:
   a. The filing process would begin with a survey of the wetland resource area by an environmental scientist and the filing of an Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation (ANRAD) with the Amherst Conservation Commission (ACC). The ACC would hold an initial public hearing, review the site conditions and then hold a findings hearing prior to issuing an Order of Resource Area Delineation (ORAD). Determinations can be appealed.
   b. An appeal can be made by a directly affected individual or a group of 10 concerned individuals.
   c. A notice would take into account local Bi-Laws but be made to the State. Local appeals go to the State Judicial Court.
   d. It often helps to include the Conservation Commissions in the design process.
   e. JC – The determination process will undoubtedly extend the CBS time line.
   f. LP believes that the town understands the “pond” to be a perennial stream.
   g. An appeal could also be made at the point of filing an NOI.

4. The feeling of the group was that process should be started. It may not be possible to get the approvals in place for the time frame of this project but it could begin the groundwork for a future project.

5. Stage 2 would be the filing of a Notice of Intent (NOI).
   a. Site design and documents would have to be very developed with grading, storm water designed, most utilities, landscape designed, etc. for an NOI filing.
   b. A public hearing follows the filing which is followed by an order of conditions issued by the ACC as the outcome of the filing is reached.
   c. The zone of abutters that would have to be notified is open to interpretation on

---

1 310 CMR 10.00: WETLANDS PROTECTION
10.58 Riverfront Area
(2) Definitions, Critical Characteristics and Boundaries. h. Where rivers flow through lakes or ponds, the riverfront area stops at the inlet and begins again at the outlet. A water body identified as a lake, pond, or reservoir on the current U.S.G.S. map or more recent map provided by the Department, is a lake or pond, unless the issuing authority determines that the water body has primarily riverine characteristics. When a water body is not identified as a lake, pond, or reservoir on the current U.S.G.S. map or more recent map provided by the Department, the water body is a river if it has primarily riverine characteristics. Riverine characteristics may include, but are not limited to, unidirectional flow that can be visually observed or measured in the field. In addition, rivers are characterized by horizontal zonation as opposed to the vertical stratification that is typically associated with lakes and ponds. Great Ponds (i.e., any pond which contained more than ten acres in its natural state, as calculated based on the surface area of lands lying below the natural high water mark; a list is available from the Department) are never rivers.
a Campus. Usually the local Conservation Commission makes the determination and it is usually best to over notify to avoid future challenges.

d. It was suggested that the process be initiate with the ACC as a consideration of the Master Plan with a caveat that the North Pond site might be considered in the near term if it were determined to be feasible.

e. The actual shallow, sludge filled, drainage basin nature of the pond should be emphasized when discussing the environmental impact of the pond.

f. A watershed analysis would be needed for the NOI. This would be a rather involved process but could be done by JNEI or the environmental firm.

g. Clarification is needed as to whether the ANRAD/ORAD delineations would be sufficient to satisfy the CBS permitting requirements. DCAM

h. There may be some wetlands boring restrictions on the site.

i. The earthen dike is from 1880’s but is not registered as a “dam”.

6. The 3d model needs to be corrected between the Student Union and the Campus Center. BH

7. DCAM needs to confirm that a Certifiable Study could be done with a back-up site/building as long as the program and costs are identical. DCAM

8. North Pleasant Street site:

a. The site under consideration is along North Pleasant Street, between the Fine Arts Center, the School of Management (SOM) and the fraternity houses on North Pleasant Street.

b. Good proximity to SOM and FAC was agreed to be a plus as was the strengthening of the North Pleasant street edge.

c. Pedestrian paths running east to west from Herter to the Studio Arts Building (SAB) and north/south to Mahar should be designated as primary paths on the diagram.

d. Massing could enhance exterior spaces and work with a proposed addition to SOM.

e. The likelihood of acquiring the fraternity sites is remote. The new building could work well with a development on that site at some future point.

f. An overhang on the building could provide a covered connector for the path from Herter to the SAB crosswalk on North Present Street.

g. Landscape development will build a connection to FAC and strengthen the connection to the covered walkway on the FAC.

h. The view framing of the FAC from the main mall should be further considered.

i. The building could also be a positive boundary for the lawn area to the east of the paved plaza.
9. Dickinson Site:
   a. There was consensus that this is a good, underutilized site, clear of utilities but
      with significant strategic conflicts with the project goal of adding as much
      classroom/academic space to the campus as possible.
   b. The possibility of shifting the building toward the east and bending the service
      road to Thompson and the Student Union toward South College was
      suggested.
   c. Serious concerns over the loss of the space in general and good swing space
      in particular were voiced.

10. Conclusions:
    a. North Pond & North Pleasant sites were both thought to be strong contenders
        and more or less equal.
    b. Environmental issues around the North Pond site are significant but should be
        engaged even if the site becomes a second or future site.
    c. Site costs (in a dual building study) would have to be determined and
        balanced with building systems or program alternates.
    d. Concerns were raised that the North Pleasant street ranking is too weighted
        and sways the results. Burt Hill should set pros and cons and let the University
        do the rankings and ratings.
    e. The Selection Matrix will be taken out of the Academic Vision PPT.

11. Next steps:
    a. There will be a meeting with the Academic Vision Group, Thursday 6/18 in the
       afternoon.
    b. The week of the 29th is being flagged for a meeting with the EOC.
    c. Part of the Monday morning phone call will be used for the planning
       upcoming meetings. Brian will join in.
Overall Model (Proposed Academic building sites in red, potential science buildings in orange)

North Pond Site (looking north)
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- Meeting Number: 1  
- Meeting Date: 6/18/09  
- Project Phase: Information Gathering  
- Meeting Location: Campus Center

### Meeting Purpose:

Project Update with Focus on Site Selection for the New Academic Classroom Building

### Attendees:

- **UMass:** Meredith Lind, Priscilla Clarkson, Barry Brown, Christine McCormick, Ron Machaud, Russell Tessier, Jean Swinney, Joel Martin, Patti Cromack, Terry Warner, Steve Goodwin, Rod Warnick, Ron Michaud, Stephen Burns, Joyce Hatch, Juanita Holler, John Lenzi, Brian Harvey  
- **F&CP:** Susan Personette, Jim Cahill, Ludmilla Pavlova, Pam Rooney, Tom Huf, Pat Daly, OIT: Heidi Dollard  
- **DCAM:** Ann Storer  
- **Burt Hill:** Steve Brittan, Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris, Alex Wing (by conference call)

### Comments:

A project overview was presented with findings. The Power Point presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.

### 1. Introduction and General Progress Update

1.1. Review project tracks & schedule.

1.1.1. The separate Academic, Classroom and Campus Vision information gathering tracks will combine into one single planning effort at the beginning of July. This begins the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan phase of the work.

1.1.2. The second track is the Certified Building Study, the programming phase for the new Academic Classroom Building. A key decision on the site is needed as soon as possible to launch this effort.

1.2. Site selection.
1.2.1. The Site Selection Committee has investigated 9 potential sites for a new building. The committee has narrowed the potential sites down to 2 options. Invites of this meeting are encouraged to give their input on these 2 sites prior to the presentation to Chancellor in July.

2. Department / Building Analysis Update
   2.1. Information Gathering
      2.1.1. Building and department summaries that evaluate existing conditions and needs are being developed.
   2.2. Building Summary
      2.2.1. 26 academic buildings are being evaluated for their condition and academic relevancy in the Academic Plan.
   2.3. Department Summary
      2.3.1. An example of a Department Profile was shown. The profile includes a department summary, present personnel counts, existing department space use and right-size department space use. The right-size space use is categorized by office, research and teaching space.
      2.3.2. Department fragmentation within a building or among several buildings is also being investigated and factored into planning.

3. Classroom Analysis Update - Proposed Program Scenarios for a new academic building
   3.1. Analysis is looking for the right mix of classroom and department space as well as looking for the right program to enliven the building.
   3.2. Looking for a program that provides a mix of learning environments and enhances student life. A building that has a mix of different size classrooms and auditoria as well as academic departments could do this.
   3.3. Current thinking is that the classroom spaces would be on the lower floors of a new building with department spaces on higher floors.
   3.4. Different splits of classroom to department spaces were reviewed.
      3.4.1. 70/30 split (classroom/dept.) = 3,040 classroom seat building. The mix would include mid and large-size classrooms plus some larger auditoria.
      3.4.2. 60/40 split = 2,640 classroom seat building. Breakout includes large and medium auditoria with mid to large -size classrooms.
      3.4.3. 50/50 split = 2,190 classroom seats. The mix of classrooms would be similar.
      3.4.4. The exact scale and mix of classrooms will require further study.
   3.5. A new building with classrooms will not solve all of the existing classroom need.
      3.5.1. Updating the current campus classroom sf/student standard to be in line with the DCAM guideline of 22sf/student would create a need of about 1,700 additional seats just to keep to the overall current number of seats. Switching to tables and chairs and removing tablet armchairs will reduce seat numbers in existing classrooms further. It is recommended that these steps be done over time and not as a wholesale, immediate change.
      3.5.2. A new building would add classroom spaces and seats so that existing classrooms & auditoria could be taken off line and renovated. The increase in seats seen in the new building will not be realized until renovations of existing classrooms & auditoria are completed.
3.5.3. The intent is to try to get as many seats as possible in the new building, but department space is needed to begin to solve the problems that exist in department program space. The right mix of departments will add life to the building which has been identified as a key project goal.

3.5.4. The existing classroom need is for mid-range classrooms (60 seats) and above.

4. Site Options Analysis, Pros and Cons

4.1. Vision

4.1.1. All of the data gathered in the department and building studies feeds into the selection of the site.

4.1.2. The site selection has been narrowed down to 3 possibilities with an option at the Pond site.

4.1.3. The new building is to be designed to encourage student learning and development. Well designed spaces can stimulate and help student performance.

4.2. Site Analysis Summary

4.2.1. Site analysis includes investigations of existing building uses, land use, districts & circulation (academic, sciences, recreation, etc.), natural systems (light, topography, vegetation, wind) and utilities. Campus planning principles (how the building best benefits the campus & make more coherent and interconnectedness) is the other central concern.

4.2.2. Site planning and building design goals were also formulated to establish priorities.

4.2.3. A decision making matrix was created to rank each site’s attributes and deficiencies against the principles & goals, sustainability, and constructability.

4.2.4. The (9) site options identified over the course of the study were reviewed (Whitmore, Parking Lot 62, South College, Draper, Tennis Courts, SOM Addition, Pond, N ISOM, Dickinson).

4.2.5. The (3) finalists are North Pond, North ISOM (FAC), and Dickinson.

4.2.6. The potential sites were required to have space for a min 150,000 sf building that is between 4-5 stories high. Classrooms would be located on lower levels with department space above.

4.2.7. Massing for each site was designed to fit with the surrounding buildings as well as be able to support programmatic needs such as double loaded corridors, etc.

4.3. Site 1A - North Pond

4.3.1. This site works with neighboring buildings to create a quad-like space to north with the Campus Center. It maintains pedestrian corridors and would feed into established areas of student activity.

4.3.2. An overlay of the utility plans influences the building footprint and shape.

4.3.3. The existing steam service in this area is in poor condition and needs to be replaced. Whether a new building is sited here or not, the steam corridor reconstruction needs to take place and should be done outside of the building construction process.

4.3.4. This site has good orientation with an expanse of south facing wall area and would not cast large shadows on surrounding buildings.

4.3.5. There is a design possibility to include a campus pedestrian path through building.

4.3.6. A building in this location would have views of the pond and open areas.

4.3.7. A section through the proposed building demonstrates that its height may help mitigate the height and size of the Campus Center with other surrounding structures.
4.3.8. Pros include: central location, the building’s meeting facilities could be used for summer conferences in conjunction with the Campus Center Hotel, capitalizes on pond, vibrant location.

4.3.9. Cons include: waterway setback requirements, historical society approval, risk assessment, existing utilities rebuilding.

4.4. Site 1B - East Pond

4.4.1. A building in this location would reinforce the edge of the N Pleasant St corridor.

4.4.2. A building in this location would create a dialogue with Morrill across the street.

4.4.3. Pros include: similar to 1A, less pond setback concerns.

4.4.4. Cons include: similar to 1A, utility concerns still present.

4.5. Site 2 - N Isenberg / Fine Arts Center

4.5.1. A building of the proposed size would work with the scale of the FAC.

4.5.2. Courtyard or plaza spaces could be reinforced and developed on the north, west and south sides, working off of the existing Isenberg school and Fine Arts Center landscape features.

4.5.3. There are a lot of utilities in this area but they are in generally good condition. A building could be located over the utilities but would not have good basement space.

4.5.4. A potential addition to the SOM is shown to demonstrate how it could work with the proposed classroom/dept building on this site.

4.5.5. This site has good orientation with a south facing wall.

4.5.6. A building in this location would reinforce the street edge at N Pleasant St, opposite the Studio Arts Building.

4.5.7. Pros include: utilities good, creates congregation space along existing highly used pedestrian paths, energizes campus core.

4.5.8. Cons include: pedestrian traffic crossing N Pleasant St would probably increase, potential encroachment on the FAC would have to be sensitively handled.

4.6. Site 3 – Dickinson Hall

4.6.1. A building of this scale would be compatible with Goodell.

4.6.2. Circulation with the new recreation center would be reinforced.

4.6.3. Existing utilities do not negatively impact a building on this site.

4.6.4. An axis would be created with the new recreation center, library, and South College.

4.6.5. A building in this location would have great views in all directions.

4.6.6. The band building is adjacent to this site. The band creates a lot of noise and would be disturbing to classes in a new classroom building here.

4.6.7. If Dickinson were to be demolished, 30K sf of space would be removed from the campus inventory. From a building conditions perspective, demolition of Dickinson is not a high priority. This effectively removes the site from consideration for a first new academic building.

4.7. Site Options Discussion

4.7.1. The pond sites 1A and 1B require wetland setback approval and historic commission review that each WILL cause a time delay. An environmental impact review may also be required.
4.7.2. The town of Amherst may consider the water to be a stream, not a pond. Streams and ponds have different setback requirements. The area needs to be delineated by a wetlands scientist for review and action by the Amherst Conservation Commission.

4.7.3. The civil engineer hired has evaluated this water body to be a pond.

4.7.3.1. If it is considered a stream, there is a 50’ set back no build zone plus a 100’ restricted build set back.

4.7.3.2. If it is a pond, there is just a 100’ restricted build set back.

4.7.4. The sites around the pond are considered to be in a historic district because Olmstead did the original landscape plan of the area and the pond has been a central campus feature for most of the history of the school.

4.7.5. The output culvert to the North of the pond is underground. This creates a barrier for the setback buffer, making option 1A viable.

4.7.6. The N Pond site (1A) is closer to the library. This location on campus has a good proximity to the Student Union & Campus Center.

4.7.7. Site option (1A) has the could create a campus ‘heart’ or symbolic/functional center that has been missing from UMass.

4.7.8. Site option (1A) is accessible to the science buildings and reinforces a connection across N Pleasant St.

4.7.9. Site option (2) is situated adjacent to land that is not owned by UMass, the fraternity houses and Newman Center. The size of the proposed building in this location near the gateway to campus may be too imposing in relation to the scale town.

4.7.10. If the Lot 62 site were developed as well as site option (2) there may be too much density in one area. Construction in site option (2) may eliminate viability of Lot 62 construction and be a limiting factor on a future ISOM addition.

4.7.11. A question was asked as to whether consideration should be given to constructing 2 smaller scale buildings. This has been determined to be too costly since twice the amount of support/non-classroom space would need to be constructed. The university would not get as much classroom/department space as it could for a single building for the money allotted to this project.

4.7.12. As a conclusion to this meeting, the attendees agree that site option (1A) be presented to the Chancellor as the first choice and site option (1B), or variation of it, as 2nd choice. The approval process for the waterway setbacks and historic commission will determine the pursuit of site option (2) SOM site.

4.8. Non-Classroom space discussion for new building

4.8.1. Bryan Harvey distributes a hand out outlining the objectives for the non-classroom program space in the new building.
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From: Carol Harris / Joel Nordberg December 21, 2009

Subject/Project Number: Combined Vision Group
New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2 Meeting Date: 8/24/09
Meeting Date: 1:30
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Campus Center #917

Meeting Purpose:
Project Update with Focus on Site Selection for the New Academic Classroom Building

Attendees: Distribution:
UMass: Stephen Burns, Ted Djaferis, Prisilla Clarkson, Meredith Lind, Rod Warnick, Dan MacCarthey, Jean Swinney, Christine McCormick, Joel Martin, Karen Schoenberg, Jay Schafer, Ron Michaud, Martha Baker, Patti Cromack, Juanita Holler, Bryan Harvey, John Lenzi, John Cunningham
F&CP: Susan Personette, Andy Soles, Pam Rooney, Ludmilla Pavlova
OIT: Copper Giloth,
DCAM: Ann Storer,
Burt Hill: Steven Brittan, Alex Wing, Emily Santilli, Carol Harris, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A project overview was presented with findings in advance of the next EOC meeting. The PowerPoint presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.

1. Emphasis is shifting from “Information Gathering & Analysis” to “Potential Solutions”, the planning for short and long term improvements to academic facilities.
   1.1. The severity of the problems in the Departments, Classroom, Buildings and Site (exterior spaces shaped by the academic buildings) are beginning summarized and quantified where that makes sense.
   1.2. As the Academic Plan advances, focus will be on:
       1.2.1. What problems can be solved in the new building,
       1.2.2. How can the new building indirectly facilitate solutions to other problems by freeing space or otherwise opening up opportunities to move or reconfigure programs, better utilizing existing facilities
       1.2.3. And, what problems will require more time and preparation before they can be tackled in a long range plan.
2. A Department conditions overview was presented in terms of the condition of the space, accessibility, compression (rightsizing) and fragmentation. Findings are still being reviewed with UMass and are preliminary. (JEN)
   2.1. Rightsizing criteria was presented. University standards and DCAM standards were used. A question was raised over peer institution comparison, but this has not been considered as a guide.
   2.2. The departmental spaces were given a good, fair, poor rating based on tours of the space. MEP (comfort) factors were generally interpreted form the building conditions reports.
   2.3. A summary of compiled Condition, Fragmentation and Compression ratings have been created. They are subject to further review with UMass before more conclusions are drawn.

3. A Classroom utilization overview was presented. (AW)
   3.1. It would be desirable to bring all classrooms up to basic standards for ADA, finishes and to correct for overcrowding (too many seats for the room size). This could take about 1,200 classroom seats out of the current inventory just to correct for conditions in existing rooms and establish a better standard and should be approached over time as renovation creates opportunities.
   3.2. In addition, a significant number of rooms should be made more “state of the art”, changing tablet arm desks layouts to table and chair rooms, flexible layout rooms and case study type rooms. This could take and additional 400 seats to out of the inventory.
   3.3. The total add for the new building of about 2,000 seats are needed just to maintain the status quo when factoring in taking off line Hills and other teaching resources that need to be taken off for renovations.
   3.4. There are other pedagogical shifts such as moving from 3 to 4 credit courses and utilizing more blended (partial on line) classes. A change of only 10% of the course load to 4 credit courses using 3 credit time slots will contribute significantly to the seating shortfall due to seats lost by removing Hills and other capacity corrections.
   3.5. (Comment) Enrollments are increasing and are currently at 4,100 freshman with a target to add 250 undergraduates per year over the next 10 years. There is also a trend for students to take more credits per semester, adding seat demand that is not necessarily related to enrollment increases.

4. A Building conditions overview was briefly given. (JEN)
   4.1. Building analysis takes into account, condition (looking at building systems components), accessibility, suitability of the floor plate and physical constraint to the current use and making recommendations as to the future use, reuse or demolition of the buildings.
   4.2. An explanation of accessibility ranking was given due to the very low percentage of fully accessible space. Three categories have been given, Full, Partial and None. Full meets current accessibility codes and excludes a number of relatively modern buildings that may have been designed for accessibility but to an obsolete criteria. These buildings, along with other limited renovation buildings are referred to as partially accessible. There are a number of older buildings that have no handicap accessibility at all.

5. A Site Selection overview was briefly given. (SB)
   5.1. The Pond Site is thought to contribute the most value to the type and characteristics (classroom, department and student life vitality) of building envisioned. The contribution to the campus could be equally as rich.
   5.2. Identified challenges including an interpretation of whether the body of water is a pond or stream have been positively advanced. The outcome of the wetland scientist and discussions with the Amherst Conservation Commission resulted in a determination that the Pond is in fact a pond which entails the least restrictive development constraints. This means that we can move forward and study the site further.
   5.3. Thinking has begun on the of massing and orientation possibilities for the building on the site.
   5.4. Overview of Conservation Commission meeting (SP)
   5.4.1. Agreement of pond boundaries and what offsets would be required were reached.
   5.4.2. Mass Environmental Protection Agency (MEPA) evaluation will trigger historic resource impact review by MHC and the local Amherst Historic Commissions. The likelihood is that this would not prevent the building development on the site, but could extend the environmental review process.

6. Physical Factors that impact what goes into the new building. (SP)
   6.1. The matrix of key issues was used to discuss what problems are best addressed in the New Academic and Classroom Building and what problems are more reasonably solved in the Comprehensive Academic Plan.
6.2. Factors that are being thought about in considering the program for the new building include benefiting the most students, making department moves with broad benefits to future backfill potential, providing spaces that are not currently available, etc.

6.3. There is an as yet unquantified need to add in computer classrooms as part of the Specialized Learning Environments.

6.4. A design emphasis will be on looking at how the new building program can be more than just an academic/department facility but also a vibrant campus asset.

6.5. Social learning space like a (learning common) café, serve many purposes and should be considered for the program element list.

6.6. We are thinking about how the ground floor of the building can be more campus focused and be an open, inviting space.

6.7. Classroom space in the new building must also include the ancillary teaming and preparation environments needed in the support of the classrooms.

6.8. There is a strong opportunity for a very significant synergy between the new building and surrounding/adjacent buildings to create a campus hub for.

7. Review schedule

7.1. We are nearing the end of the Information Gathering and Analysis phase and moving into the Comprehensive Plan and Certifiable Building Study will be starting soon.

7.2. The building design will take the full year of 2010 with construction to follow and occupancy in early 2013.
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From: Emily Santilli

November 11, 2009 (revised 12/21/09)

Subject/Project Number: Combined Academic Vision

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 3
Meeting Date: 11/05/2009
Project Phase: ST02
Meeting Location: Facilities Building

Meeting Purpose:
To identify what goes into the NACB, what the building program is, and what is to be completed on this phase

Attendees: Distribution:
Burt Hill
Joel Nordberg, Steven Brittan, Alex Wing, Emily Santilli, Carol Harris
DCAM
Ann Storer
UMass
Campus and Facilities Planning: Ludmilla Pavlova, Susan Personette, Jim Cahill, Pat Daly
Administration: Bryan Harvey, John Cunningham, Juanita Holler, Joyce Hatch, James Staros
Department Representatives: Carol Barr, Ted Djaferos, Jay Schaefer, Ron Michaud, Karen Shoenberger, Marjorie Aelion, Robert Feldman, Meredith Lind
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing

Comments: To update the Combined Vision Group on the Comprehensive Plan and present department recommendation for the New Academic and Classroom Building. The Power Point presentation of the meeting has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.

1. There are two parallel studies – an academic comprehensive plan for the campus and a new academic campus building (NACB). Though they are separate studies, they inform and respond to each other.
   a. The comprehensive plan includes:
      1) 27 buildings (2 million gross square feet),
      2) 47 departments (580,000 net square feet) including 546 instructors and 800 staff,
      3) 237 registrar-scheduled classrooms (roughly 12,500 seats, 188,000 SF). Registrar-scheduled classrooms in non-academic buildings (eg: science buildings) have been included.
   b. The classrooms have been divided into 2 groups: registrar-scheduled and departmental. Departmental classrooms are included in the departmental net area above. The classroom analysis looks at all classrooms, both registrar-scheduled and departmental.
   c. There is a similar study of the science and engineering departments.
2. For registrar-scheduled classrooms:
   a. Classroom conditions have been evaluated for architectural considerations, setting the ratings in terms of current standards for good classroom space. Building conditions and other systemic concerns such as HVAC and ADA are overlaid on architectural room ratings to show the impact of building conditions on classrooms which generally lowers the room rating from what it would be in a standalone consideration.
   b. 66% target utilization is between 8am and 6pm. Current average utilization is around 69%. Burt Hill will offer recommendations to level extreme peaks and push more utilization into later afternoon hours.
   c. Improvements in instructional efficiency can help alleviate pressures on existing classroom inventory.
      1) Bryan Harvey identified opportunities in shifting GenEd 3 credit courses to 4 credits, including more blended courses, and increasing internships and practica as potential means of increasing efficiency.
      2) Alex Wing tested across all course offerings and found that if 10% of the courses saw a 25% increase in efficiency (example: courses from 3 to 4 credits), about 1,100 seats would become available.
      3) Pedagogy and programmatic changes can offer flexibility and reduce demand on the existing inventory.
      4) Overall increased instructional efficiency can sustain classroom functions without new seats for a couple years.
      5) A new classroom building is needed to resolve other classroom pressures, such as condition, room sizes and types not currently available, overcrowding, flexibility, classroom mix, etc.
   d. Some classrooms will come offline with building demolition (example: Hills – 166 seats)
   e. Auditoria are a key part of the discussion, especially since almost 50% of all instruction currently occurs in auditoria.
   f. Some of classroom issues can be resolved through programming the NACB while others can only be resolved as part of the Comprehensive Plan.
   g. The NACB should have 2000 registrar-scheduled seats or less. Susan Personette’s informal survey of other academic institutions yielded 2000 seats as an upper limit, which is in agreement with the Burt Hill recommendation. More seats is thought to be too much student traffic to handle during class changes.
3. For Departmental Classrooms:
   a. A system has been developed to group rooms for analysis. Schedule driven rooms are identified from perpetually available rooms. Within those categories, specialized rooms are identified from generic rooms.
   b. The demand analysis is in progress.
4. Departmental issues will be addressed in both the Comprehensive Plan and NACB. This meeting’s goal is to identify the departments suitable for the NACB. Other department issues are to be resolved in the Comprehensive Plan with the NACB as the first major step in the process to resolve many other issues.
5. Deans are not currently planned for the new building. Additional Dean space is part of the Comprehensive Plan and will be addressed elsewhere on campus.
6. The vacancy of Hills needs to occur prior to the implementing of the Comprehensive Plan and functions currently within Hills are not planned to be transferred in-kind to the NACB.
7. Susan Personette and Jim Cahill identified the larger discussion about how to best spend the now available resources.
8. Overall, the Combined Academic Vision Group approved Burt Hill’s recommendation of potential department candidates for the NACB:
   a. Communications & Journalism
   b. Film Studies
   c. Linguistics

   These departments were felt to fit the criteria of:
   d. Offer the types of space which will solve the candidate departments’ needs
   e. Add vibrancy to the building
   f. Open up and create backfill opportunities to solve other problems in existing buildings

NEXT STEPS:

- Finalize ST02 Information Gathering, findings and complete reports.
- Compile Burt Hill options
- Hold on CBS & CACFP next phases until resolution of revised scope

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL

/s/
Emily Santilli (revisions to pick up Ann Storer Comments by Joel Nordberg, 12/21/09)
November 11, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Emily Santilli
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Subject/Project Number: Undergraduate Education Council

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1  Meeting Date: May 21, 2009 4:00pm – 5:30pm  Project Phase: Information Gathering  Meeting Location: UMass Facilities & Campus Planning Office

Meeting Purpose:
Classroom Utilization & General Project Overview

Attendees: Distribution:
UMass Admin: Bryan Harvey  Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova
Campus Planning: Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova  Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan, Steve Brittan, Joel Nordberg
UMass Faculty: Ernie May, John McCarthy, Lisa Selkirk, Lisa Green
Burt Hill: Joel Nordberg, Michael Reagan, Steve Brittan, Emily Santilli, Alex Wing
DCAM: Ann Storer

Comments: An overview of the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Facilities Plan (CACFP) was presented with an emphasis on Classroom benchmarks and utilization. The Power Point presentation of the meeting was distributed in hand-out form and has been posted to the UMass Share Site for reference.

Classroom Utilization Update:

1. Alex presented the Boyer Commission Study on reinventing undergraduate education. Many of the recommendations directly affect the learning environment. The key items presented were: 1) moving with ease from media enabled to face-to-face contact, 2) creating opportunities for peer mentoring, and 3) making room for individuals to find their voice. All of these items have impacts on the learning environment ranging from increased emphasis on interactions and the supporting technologies, opportunities/space/furnishings for teaming, and interdisciplinary connections.

2. The TEAL classroom at MIT was presented as a large classroom where teaming and interaction are emphasized. This setup is an example of effectively lecturing to large groups of students.

3. Alex presented that modern classroom buildings tend to be interdisciplinary and complete with programmed public resources space. Media permeates the building, along with food service and other student amenities to animate the building and create community.

4. Ideas for transforming the large lecture hall scenario were presented. Other than the TEAL model, blended courses, webcasts, and other extensions of the learning environment were discussed.
5. Progress on the Student and Faculty questionnaires was discussed. Both questionnaires have now been closed and analysis has begun.
   
a. Student responses came from all academic levels. Students appear to have experienced all room sizes and they are fairly satisfied, though further analysis of the open-ended questions will expand upon that. Smaller rooms are preferred (40 or less). The students identify the best learning environments in SOM. They value room condition, thermal comfort, lighting/daylight, and access to technology.

b. The Faculty also prefers smaller rooms and identified SOM as having the best learning environments. They feel the poor condition of the classrooms is a significant problem that limits their effectiveness. The faculty identified the following as limiting: condition of space, availability of technology, seating configuration, scheduling issues, overcrowding, and line of sight/access to teaching wall issues. The questionnaire shows that the faculty feels it is less important to construct/renovate large rooms. The fact that only a small percentage of the faculty teach in the very large rooms should be considered. For large rooms, tiered seating in a case method/horseshoe style is preferred.

c. Bryan Harvey provided a list of buildings/rooms that the faculty selected as the best and worst on campus from the questionnaire. Beyond new construction, the most favorable learning environments were those affected by capital investments. The case method rooms in SOM ranked highest for most favorable. Auditoria in Morrill 2, Bartlett, Hasbrouck, Fernald, and Goessman ranked among the least favorable.

6. Alex presented benchmark data that identified UMass classrooms along with classrooms from Berkley, UCConn, BU, and MIT. The SF per Student FTE was also benchmarked against SCUP data. SCUP identifies an average 7.8 SF/FTE whereas UMass has roughly 6.2 SF/FTE, meaning +/- 47,000 SF less than the SCUP target.

7. Classroom right sizing was discussed. Alex identified that the learning environments tend to be overfilled on average by surpassing their target percent full of between 60 and 70%. Lecture Halls/Auditoria have a target of 70 to 75%, which is also being surpassed. Both put pressure on the existing inventory and scheduling. There is little room for flexibility or overhead to accommodate surplus demand.

8. Another pressure on classroom right sizing is the student station size. Current UMass practice is to provide one student station for every 15 NSF (on average). Modern learning environment design and pedagogy drives a larger student station size. DCAM uses an average of 22 NSF per student station. Alex presented classroom plans that showed the existing condition (15 NSF per student station), an improved layout (roughly 19 NSF), and idealized scenarios (roughly 26-32 NSF, depending on furnishings). This exercise demonstrates that if existing classrooms were right-sized, reduced seat counts would result that would have a significant effect on the existing inventory. New classrooms will need to be built larger to accommodate the same number of students.

9. Alex presented many different room layout types, including ideal rooms for tablet arm chairs, seminar (tables and chairs), lecture, and multi-venue.

10. The overall effect of classroom right-sizing on the existing inventory will be a shift toward rooms with fewer chairs. Density in the inventory will shift toward lower capacity rooms (< 20 and 20-40 seats). This shift presents an opportunity to build new in the larger sizes (60-150 seat rooms).

11. Alex presented the following rooms being considered for taking offline by the Classroom Vision Group: Fernald 11, Bartlett 65, Morrill II 131, Ag Engineering 119 and 107, Morrill I 329, School of Management 133, Goessman 20, Hasbrouck 20 and 114, and Totman 24 (which may be a departmental space).

12. The group suggested that a dedicated testing center/facility could help take some of the schedule load off of the auditoria.

13. The group identified what they felt to be an inevitable trend toward large classrooms, especially with increasing enrollments and decreasing faculty. Ernie May identified that the choices center on quality. Susan Personnette challenged the group to see the new building as an opportunity to raise the bar of learning environments on campus.

14. The group asked how big a classroom becomes before it significantly affects the student experience, and how to draw that line. They wondered if the size of a classroom can be overcome by other factors such as proximity/eye
contact with the professor, student engagement, and/or the ability to effectively see projection screen. They also asked where the line is where a class becomes too large for teaming and must be more standard lecture.

15. There was discussion about designing for what the students enjoy versus what they actually learn. The group appears focused upon the educational potential of learning environments over their enjoyment value.

16. Bryan Harvey identified that the university will be relying on solo professors with minimal support. Alex identified that high tech rooms require significant support from TAs, AV/IT technicians, and curriculum development to use the spaces. Though this appears a challenge to the university currently, Ernie May suggested that such rooms would push the university to remake itself.

   a. The group suggested that computer/IT studies departments also be housed in this building to leverage students and faculty with this specialty.

17. Potential new building programs were presented and discussed. It was agreed that the new building will not be a complete singular answer for the inventory need or to take entire buildings offline, though it is an opportunity to add classroom seats to the inventory and be the catalyst for change across the campus. The potential scenarios presented were as follows:

   a. 100% Classrooms – Large, no departmental space
      1) 8-60 seat, 4-80 seat, 5-100 seat, 4-150 seat, 2-250 seat, 1-400 seat (2800 seats)
      2) Question of logistics – moving that many students in and out effectively everyday
      3) Limited sense of community or campus life

   b. 100% Classrooms – Mix of sizes, no departmental space
      1) 8-35 seat, 8-40 seat, 10-60 seat, 6-80 seat, 2-100 seat, 2-250 seat, 1-400 seat (2780 seats)
      2) Not much difference in seat count, same concerns

   c. Replace Hills Hall – example of a roughly 40% Classroom/60% Departmental split
      1) 8-60 seat, 4-80 seat, 1-350 seat (1150 seats, not including reduction for those UMass Classroom seats taken offline in Hills)
      2) Does not add much space to the classroom inventory, not too much of a mix

   d. Replace Bartlett Hall – example of a roughly 50/50 split
      1) 2-60 seat, 4-80 seat, 3-100 seat, 2-350 seat (1440 seats, not including reduction for those UMass Classroom seats taken offline in Bartlett)
      2) The remaining question is whether or not 50% classrooms will be enough

   e. Replace South College – example of a roughly 80/20 split
      1) 12-60 seat, 9-80 seat, 2-150 seat, 1-250 seat, 1-400 seat (2390 seats)
      2) Group identified that an 80/20 or 70/30 split should be explored further, since this ratio promotes a significant gain of classroom seats as well as provides a fair amount of space for departmental use

18. Alex identified several building program goals, including creating a strong learning community and active environment for a successful classroom building. This goal can be achieved by mixing learning environment types, providing departmental anchors, and enhancing student life. The building program must also be matched to its height in order to address logistical issues.
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Subject/Project Number: School of Education

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number:  Meeting Date:  Project Phase:  Meeting Location:
1  3/20/09  Information Gathering  Hills House
11:00  ST02

Meeting Purpose:

Education Policy, Research, and Administration (EPRA), Space Use

Attendees:  
EPRA, Joe Berger – Chair
EPRA, Susan Young – Business Manager
UMass F&C, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. **Department Background information**

3.1. The Department of Educational Policy, Research, and Administration (EPRA) seeks to promote educational policy and perspectives needed to enrich educational practices, prepare leaders in educational policy and administration, and advance educational research and evaluation methodologies that provide the basis for effective knowledge generation and decision making, particularly in regard to three major settings: K-12 schooling, higher or post-secondary education, and international contexts. Towards this end, the Department of EPRA maintains research-oriented graduate programs of study, practitioner-oriented graduate programs of study, and organized academic outreach projects (with close ties to programs of study). ¹

3.2. The Department concentration areas are:

3.2.1. **Education Policy and Leadership**, offering: Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies (CAGS); and, Doctoral (Ed.D.) programs.


3.2.3. **Educational Administration**, offering: CAGS; and, Masters (M.Ed.) programs.

3.2.4. **Higher Education**, offering: M.Ed and CAGS programs.

3.2.5. **International Education**, offering: an M.Ed. program.

3.2.6. **Policy Studies**, offering: M.Ed. and CAGS programs.

3.2.7. **Research Centers** include: Center for Educational Policy; Center for Educational Assessment; Center for International Education. ¹

3.3. One of the top 3 International Education programs in the United States. On par with Stanford and Harvard.

3.4. Student affairs programs have moved over to the School of Education. **Professional staff have adjunct appointments and close ties to Higher Education programs.**

3.5. **Research Evaluations and Methods Program (REMP)** is generally regarded as one of the top three programs in North America specializing in the areas of educational psychometric and statistical research and practice, instrument development and data analysis. For example, the ABE Adult Basic Education sets the standard for testing and adult literacy for the State.

4. **Department Headcount (Population)**

4.1. Students: 156 EDD, 24 CAGS & 64 MED = 244 total

4.2. Faculty & Staff: 4 Professors; 1 Professors Emeritus; 5 Associate Professors; 8 Assistant Professors; 2 Distinguished Professors; 3 Lecturers; 6 Research Center Managers & Assistants; 2 Senior Research Fellow; and, 2 Administrative Assistants (shared with SDPPSA) = 33 total. ²

4.3. PI (principal investigators) are research orientated professional staff.

4.4. The **School of Education has an Undergraduate Minor and each department offers undergraduate courses including general education courses.**

4.5. **Research Evaluations and Methods Program (REMP)** has grown from 3 to 5.

4.6. **Higher Education faculty has grown from 1 to 3.**

---

¹ Information excerpted from EPRA’s Website.

² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
4.7. Educational Administration Faculty has remained level.
4.8. International Education Faculty has also remained level.
4.9. The department has recently had their first endowed professorship in the school.
4.10. They are expecting 2 major retirements in the next 3 years Ron Hambleton & David Evans (center for international education).
4.11. There is always at least 1 visiting scholar in their department.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions
5.1. EPRA occupies 11,842 nsf, all in Hills House. Hills South, 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors with the primary concentration of space on floors 1 & 2. The department also has space in Hills North, 4th floor.
5.2. Hills House in general is not good quality space (air conditioning, electrical service, mold, deteriorating interior and exterior, etc.).

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)
6.1. The need was emphasized to get the whole school of education together to facilitate a higher level of synergy across programs.
6.2. The Department is working on a lot of cross discipline classes with sciences, political sciences, etc.
6.3. SAREO and some REMP graduate assistants are isolated in Hills north, 4th floor.
6.4. Working closely with Humanities programs, CPPA in Political Science in particular. Also working with Katie McDermitt. Advising in polymer sciences.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations
7.1. It will be necessary to relocate from Hills South in the near future because of the deteriorating conditions. No specific plans were noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
8.1. The benefits of getting the whole school of Education under one roof were noted.
8.2. Possibility of Arnold House. Acknowledge to be in better condition and somewhat closer to Furcolo. Mark's Meadow is adjacent to Furcolo Hall. If vacated by Amherst public schools as currently proposed, potential to relocate.
8.3. Education should be the most multi-disciplinary of the Schools and would ideally be more centrally located to the campus.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
9.1. The Department brings in a lot of high profile, outside people and the image of the building does not compliment the high status of the School/Department.
9.2. Common space:
   9.2.1. Collaborative work room / project rooms are needed. Extensive work goes on continually in grant proposal writing across the departments. These would not need to be dedicated to specific departments as users could change over as projects start and finish.
   9.2.2. International development programs and testing development require large group input and space to meet. Graduate students involved in these efforts are atypical as professional experience is a prerequisite.
   9.2.3. Program rooms could be more like a studio or an academic lab environment.
9.3. There is no graduate student gathering space. A room (or rooms) that function like 287 with a meetings space and lounge/kitchenette would serve the purpose. Ideal space should be about twice the size with a separate lounge and meeting space to allow simultaneous use.
9.4. Room 287 is currently used entirely by international students. The grad student space they have on the first floor should be folded in with the international lounge (287) so the two groups would interact.

9.5. More space should be available that permits casual interaction between personnel, programs and departments.

9.6. Private office spaces are needed but they are trying to encourage flexible spaces and getting people to be less proprietary about their space.

9.7. A reception space is needed for hosting speakers and distinguished guests. Gatherings envisioned would include light fare for 40 to 50 people. They currently use the Campus Center (10th floor) and Newman Center but neither are ideally situated near their available lecture spaces or fitted out for their needs. The Department also has to pay for the use of these rooms. The Studio Arts central gallery space has also been used but at a fee. A reception space could be shared with other users but should be more proximate to the School of Education.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. The Department generates a lot of outside income through its grant programs.

10.2. Center for International Education projects range from 1 to 5 years i.e. Afghanistan where they are engaged in helping to reestablish schools. The program is in its 3rd year of a 5 year program. UMass teams go to Afghanistan and Afghans come to UMass. Likely to be funded for an additional 5 years. Similar programs in Indonesia, Malawi and Sudan.

10.3. Center for Educational Assessment

10.4. Center for Education Policy

10.5. CVSR

10.6. SAREO

10.7. Community College Leadership Academy

10.8. Programs are thought to be on the upswing and their success has made it possible to grow more initiatives.

10.9. Arizona State model of Two types of academic units Non-disciplinary academic units

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. More information needed.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. More information needed.
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1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
      1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
      1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
      1.3.3. Department location plans.
      1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
      1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher
        education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
      2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and
              department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and
              renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. The Department of Student Development and Pupil Personnel Services (SDPPS) focuses on the development of the individual pupil within the context of a variety of formal educational settings (N-16). Research and scholarship are linked to the study of individual students and their relationships with peers, educators, and families. Study also includes relationships within and among various social groups and their interactions with educational systems, families, and communities. Research and scholarship enable students to participate in the development of innovative program models and in the deeper understanding of individuals and groups in formal educational settings. Research is shaped by our commitment to social justice and diversity. 1

3.2. The Department concentration areas are:

3.2.1. Special Education, offering: Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies (CAGS); Doctoral; and, Masters Degree programs. The demand tends to be for late afternoon programs for working grad students. Some under graduates do take courses in the program as well.

3.2.2. School Psychology, offering: CAGS; Masters; and, PHD programs. The school is approved by the American Psychological Association.

3.2.3. Social Justice Education, offering: CAGS; Masters; and Doctoral programs. This is a unique program that uses a lot of weekend and evening time slots.

3.2.4. School Counseling, offering: Masters and Doctoral programs. 1

3.3. Research Center: the Center for School Counseling Outcome Research. 1

3.4. All concentrations, except School Psychology, offer undergraduate courses, for example, Introduction to Special Education (100 students), Love and Work (120 students 2/week), General Education Course breaks down into 10 student group counseling sessions giving students experience in a group counseling setting. Educational Psychology undergraduate courses (300 student lecturer and 300 students on line).

3.5. There is also a strong mission of partnerships out in regional school districts with particular association with the Springfield school system.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. Students: 27 PHD, 38 EDD, 59 CAGS & 73 MED = 197 total

4.2. Faculty & Staff: 5 Professors; 2 Professors Emerita; 5 Associate Professors; 3 Assistant Professors; 1 Visiting Assistant Professors; 1 Senior Research Fellow; and, 2 Administrative Assistants (shared with EPRA) = 19 total 2. There will be one new Assistant Professor on 9/01/09.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. SDPPS occupies 5,925 nsf, all in Hills House.

5.2. Hills South, 1st, 3rd and 4th floors with the primary concentration of space on floor 3.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. Communications Disorders will be moving from the School of Public Health to the School of Education.

6.2. Strong collaborations between other departments and programs in Hills South.

---

1 Information excerpted from SDPPS’s Website.
2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
6.3. One mile distance between Furcolo and Hills puts limits on interactions within the SOE administrative staff and TECS.

6.4. The primary classroom they use are in Furcolo.

6.5. SOE has 5 state cars which are used to get to programs in the regional school systems but are also used for travel back and forth to Furcolo. Parking can be problematic.


6.7. Special Education has strong collaborations with Communications Disorders.

6.8. Starting up connections with Nanotechnology and other sciences.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. Original reorganization proposes that the Department of Communication Disorders merge with the School of Education and is seen as a good complement for the special education programs. This plan has changed and the results are unknown.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. No specific plans are in place, however, combining with the departments in Furcolo would be highly desirable. Mark's Meadow is adjacent to Furcolo Hall. If vacated by Amherst public schools as currently proposed, there is potential to relocate SOE departments from Hills. Education should be the most inter-disciplinary and would ideally be more centrally located on campus.

9. Department Space & Technology Needs

9.1. Space for receiving high profile special guests and outside speakers.

9.2. Technology rich classrooms are needed for teaching and support of research programs. Rooms should have smart boards and equipment for web based interaction to enable linking with international programs.

9.3. Space is needed for interdepartmental meetings, both formal meeting rooms and casual lounge/lunch room spaces.

9.4. Office space should also be available for Springfield school system coordinators when they are working on campus.

10. Department / Faculty Initiatives

10.1. Proposed Center for youth at risk, Center for School Counseling Outcome Research.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. Educational Psychology large general education auditoria class.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. Center for School Counseling Outcome Research. Special Education faculty have DOE grants in collaboration with Communications Disorders.
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1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
       1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
       1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
       1.3.3. Department location plans.
       1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
       1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background Information

3.1. The Department of Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies (TECS) seeks to improve public education through (1) the planning, delivery, and continuous improvement of K-12 teacher education programs at the undergraduate and Master’s levels; (2) research and advanced study that furthers understanding of teacher education, curriculum development, teaching, and learning; (3) leadership in policy development and the promotion of effective teacher education, curriculum, and school practices in the Commonwealth.  

3.2. Mission: To prepare researchers and practitioners to engage in collaborative praxis (research and instruction) with a wide-range of partners to develop innovative practices to improve teaching and learning.  

3.3. The Department concentration areas are:

3.3.1. Doctoral (Ed.D.) degrees are offered in the following areas: Child and Family Studies; Language, Literacy and Culture; Mathematics, Science and Learning Technologies; Teacher Education and School Improvement.  

3.3.2. Master’s (M.Ed.) degrees are offered in the following areas:

3.3.2.1. Learning, Media and Technology  

3.3.2.2. Elementary and Early Childhood Teacher Education: Child Study and Early Education; Collaborative Teacher Education (Leading to Massachusetts Initial Licensure in Early Childhood or Elementary Education); Bridges to the Future (leading to Massachusetts Initial Licensure in Elementary Education)  

3.3.2.3. Language, Literacy and Culture Master’s: Bilingual/E.S.L./Multicultural Education; Reading and Writing  

3.3.2.4. Secondary Teacher Education: Secondary Teacher Education Program (leading to Massachusetts Initial Licensure in Middle School or High School); Bridges to the Future (leading to Massachusetts Initial Licensure in Middle School or High School); 180 Days in Springfield Project (leading to Massachusetts Initial Licensure in Middle School or High School)  

3.3.3. The Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGS) is offered in the following areas: Bilingual/ESL/Multicultural Education; Child and Family Studies; Learning, Media and Technology; Mathematics, Science, and Learning Technologies; Reading and Writing; Secondary Teacher Education  

3.3.4. Post-Baccalaureate licensure options are offered in the following areas: Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Licensure  

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. Students: 151 EDD, 11 CAGS & 226 MED = 388 total  

---

1 Information excerpted from TECS’s Website.
4.2. Faculty & Staff: 10 Professors; 1 Professors Emeritus; 5 Associate Professors; 9 Assistant Professors; 1 Visiting Associate Professor; 3 Sr. Lecturers; 5 Lecturers; 1 Project Manager; and, 1 Administrative Assistants = 36 total. Anticipate additional 1 Assistant Professor in 2009.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. TECS occupies 10,745 nsf, all of which is in Furcolo Hall with space on all levels.

5.2. The layout of offices into individual "cells" does not promote interaction and collaboration amongst the faculty and staff.

6. Department Adjacencies (neighborhoods)

6.1. Need closer contact with Arts and Sciences.

6.1.1. English and the national writing program, Linguistics and foreign languages.

6.1.2. Utilizing shared faculty and bringing in visiting, cross discipline lecturers.

6.1.3. Working with Sociology (urban studies).

6.1.4. SRRI works with the faculty in math and science education.

6.1.5. STEMNET works with NSM (math and science faculty).

6.1.6. Licensure programs work with SBS, HFA, NSM.

6.1.7. TECS would benefit from being in the same building as the rest of SOE.

7. Current Relocations or renovations

7.1. No immediate plans noted. The School of Education would benefit if all departments were to be in one building.

8. Proposed Relocations or renovations

8.1. The Mark’s Meadows school could become available if the school district moves its programs out. It could take an estimated $8 to $10 million to abate and renovate the Mark’s for SOE use.

8.2. The SOE is one of the most inter-disciplinary of the Schools at UMass and would ideally be more centrally located on campus.

9. Department Space & Technology Needs

9.1. Space for accommodating extensive collaborative (virtual and physical) among a variety of partners for research and instruction: School Districts, State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, SOE Centers, Departments in the Arts and Sciences, Community/Business Partners, Foundation partners.

9.2. Space to accommodate extensive (physical) collaboration among faculty in each of four Concentration and among TECS Concentrations.

9.3. Space for wide-ranging research and development of teaching, curriculum, materials, transcripts (e.g. video view, editing, analysis presentation).

---

Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
9.4. Storage for materials and equipment (cameras, archives, manipulatives, specialized software, demonstration kits needed for instruction, workshops).

9.5. Technology rich classrooms that can be configured for different purposes (large group meetings, break-out groups) that are near to the materials and equipment needed for instruction.

9.6. Space for students and faculty to meet and socialize. Most spaces that serve the purpose know are in private offices and do not lend themselves to spontaneous collaboration.

9.7. In addition to face to face spaces, technological rooms are needed for virtual meetings. There is a movement toward communications with state, foundation partners (i.e. The Wallace Foundation) via video conferencing.

9.8. Large scale collaboration space: must be flexible, must have large gathering potential 100 to 200 person sit down, 10 to 20 person conference rooms, 4 to 5 person break-out spaces.

10. Department / Faculty Initiatives

10.1. In line for educational grant money that will bring in more faculty but require more space. This will be a 5 year process beginning in the fall of 09.

10.2. There is an intent to expand programs with Political Sciences.

10.3. “Research and engagement”

10.4. Shifting the way they interact with the local and regional school districts.

10.5. An exchange is desirable, to bring teachers in from the districts in addition to sending UMass educators out (STEMNET, SRRI).

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. The Department has most of the defined high needs and will be well configured for stimulus funding for its teacher education reconfiguration.

11.2. 180 days in Springfield secondary schools

11.3. ACCELA in-service English as a Second Language sprung out of English teaching only mandate

11.4. Partnerships existing in Springfield, Holyoke. Federal reform is moving toward expanding Schools of Education associations into wider regions.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. ACCELA, School university partnerships, STEM Institute, SRRI. Specifics were not discussed.
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1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
      1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
      1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
      1.3.3. Department location plans.
      1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
      1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to address the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background Information

3.1. School of Education Mission Statement: The School of Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst is dedicated to enhancing the practice of education through scholarship that informs the preparation of educational professionals, the improvement of educational systems, and the development of educational policy. Our approach is shaped by our fundamental commitment to social justice and diversity and by our belief in the essential importance of national and international perspectives as we advance education in the Commonwealth as a model for the nation. ¹

3.2. The School of Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst is an NCATE-approved comprehensive professional school providing specialized preparation in diverse areas of education. The School offers graduate programs leading to the Master of Education (M.Ed.) and Doctor of Education (Ed.D.). The Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) is granted to those who successfully complete the American Psychological Association-accredited School Psychology Program. The School also awards a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGS). Graduate programs in the School provide opportunities for advanced study and research in education and foster the development of innovative responses to challenges in the field of education. They can be designed to meet licensure guidelines, licensing requirements, professional association recommendations, School and University requirements, and individual student goals. As a research-oriented, Land-Grant institution, the School of Education recognizes its responsibility to offer two types of graduate academic programs: programs that prepare educational scholars to further educational theory, policy, and research; and programs that prepare educational practitioners for roles in public education. ²

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Accountant I, 1; Administrative Analyst III, 1; Administrative Secretary I, 1; Assoc Dean, Academic Affairs, 1; Clerk III, 10; Clerk IV, 1; Dean, School of Education, 1; Departmental Assistant, 1; Graduate Fellowships, 1; Graduate Project Assistant, 17; Graduate Research Assistant, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 31; Graduate Teaching Associate, 15; Program Coordinator I, 1; Senior Lecturer A U of M, 1; Senior Research Fellow UM, 1; Sr Financial/Budget Analyst, 1; Staff Assistant, 1; Staff Writer/Editor, 1; Student Employee, 21; Totaling 124. ³

4.2. There are 65 full-time faculty in the School of Education, there will be 1-2 new Assistant Professors on 9/1/09.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

Schoolwide

5.1. The School of Education Dean’s offices occupies 16,618 nsf (15,723 sf in Furcolo Hall and 895 sf in Hills House).

5.2. The original reorganization plan has the Department of Communications Disorder (COMDIS) will be joining the School of Education in 2009-2010. ⁴ The original reorganization plan has changed and the results are unknown.

¹ Information excerpted from School of Education’s Website.
² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
³ Information excerpted from Department information distributed at the meeting.
5.3. They are located in two buildings (Hills South, Furcolo Hall). There is some space in Hills North. Faculty, students and staff in Hills North are more than a mile from administrative offices, academic affairs, business office, educator licensure office, educator information office, media services and field experience and assessment office.

5.4. No central location. The School has relationships, collaborations, and/or licensure programs in every school and college at UMass Amherst. Yet, our administrative offices are located at the very edge of campus. Education should be the most interdisciplinary of the schools and would ideally be more centrally located on campus.

5.5. School of Education National Council for the Accreditation of Teaching Educators (NCATE) accreditation includes all UMass Amherst educator licensure programs. No central location for licensure candidates for advising, pre-advising, paperwork completion. Educator Licensure Office, Field Experience and Assessment Office, and Educator Information Office are located at far edge of campus (Furcolo) and are in three separate locations within Furcolo. Field Experience and Assessment Office is not accessible by elevator.

5.6. Annually more than 200 Education Minors have to travel to the far edge of campus (Furcolo Hall) for advising and to complete paperwork.

5.7. Very few opportunities for informal collaboration and community building.

5.8. No auditorium or classroom space large enough and/or appropriate (e.g. condition, size, location) for school-wide meetings and events, and for off campus groups (state and national organizations, K-12 teachers and administrators, policy leaders, summer institutes, conferences, alumni gatherings).

5.9. Limited appropriate classroom space (e.g. only one classroom in Furcolo is accessible) only four university classrooms in Hill South are renovated/university classrooms and are difficult to schedule, SOE classroom space is in very poor condition.

5.10. Limited space for concentration and department wide meetings, completing with classes and other meetings.

5.11. Only accessible computer lab (also used for classes and workshops) is in Hills South.

5.12. Need to use daily courier between buildings for mail and other deliveries, requiring student help and state car (delays and increased potential for problems).

5.13. Tech staff and media services are in Furcolo requiring distance and time to get to Hills.

5.14. Meetings between administrators, faculty and/or staff located in different buildings take more time to schedule and for travel back and forth.

5.15. Limited or no space for TAs to prepare for classes, grade papers, meet with students, etc.

5.16. Limited space for RAs to work and to be located near faculty supervisors.

5.17. No building wide air conditioning in any building (including Com Dis?).

5.18. No virtual meeting room – faculty, staff and students are working with nationwide and international colleagues.

5.19. Computers and space for learning and using electronic accreditation-mandated assessment system needs to be provided in Hills, including graduate assistantship staffing because of distance from Furcolo Field Experience and Assessment Office.
Furcolo

5.20. No elevator, only one classroom is accessible, rest of classrooms and 2 instructional and one open computer lab are in basement.  

5.21. Many faculty offices are located in the basement and second floor and are not accessible. 

5.22. Faculty using manipulative materials for mathematics and science education classes have limited ability to move them from floor to floor without an elevator.

5.23. Classroom on first floor has odor problem that has not been identified for several months, at risk of condemnation. This problem has been resolved.

5.24. No building wide air conditioning for faculty, staff and students who work during the summer months.

5.25. Potential center for university school partnerships with faculty located in Furcolo, no appropriate/accessible space for meetings, staff, materials.

5.26. Ceiling tiles are aging/loose/falling e.g., Executive Assistant to the Dean was dislocated for 5-6 months waiting for repair, 13 tiles fell on desk. Dangerous.

5.27. Presence of asbestos requires major and costly repairs, dislocation, and time.

5.28. No Lounge space for faculty for informal gatherings.

5.29. Distance from food and beverages requires leaving building and difficulty providing refreshments for guests.

5.30. Kitchen space on second floor in disrepair, inappropriate for office space.

5.31. Problems parking when faculty moves around the campus to other facilities.

Hills South and North

5.32. No building wide air conditioning.

5.33. Electrical access limits ability to provide air conditioning for faculty, staff and student who work during summer months.

5.34. Individual room air conditioners located in administrative spaces are aging, loud, inefficient.

5.35. Limits ability to provide computer access in offices and in computer labs.

5.36. Major mold and insect pest problem.

5.37. Doors and windows are rotting.

5.38. Outside panels are falling off.

5.39. Purchased psychological testing materials for School Psychology program need to be secure – we have had to provide locking cabinets.

5.40. Space to conduct videotaped counseling training sessions and to lock taped sessions and equipment.

5.41. Limited appropriate space for comprehensive exams and oral dissertation defenses.
5.42. No reception area for chairs to greet guests.  

5.43. No reception area for visitors (lose some in transition to other building).  

5.44. Inadequate parking for visitors and state vehicles.  

5.45. Need appropriate space for displays and announcements.  

5.46. Shared mailroom requires locking at all times, only those with keys (full-time faculty and staff) have access, hand carried items are delivered to administrative office and/or slid under door.  

5.47. No room available for group processing room that holds more than 30.  

5.48. No appropriate place for 2 all day workshop/course sessions.  

5.49. Need rooms with observation mirrors (IPO uses the only observation classroom in summer for storage, observation room is being used for center staff).  

5.50. No lounge space for faculty for informal gatherings.  

5.51. Kitchen/bathroom space (from dormitory days) is in disrepair.  

5.52. Flooding in basement has caused LARP to move items from basement and occupy 105 and 101, previously used for events and classes.  

**Hills North**  

5.53. SAREO, graduate assistants and adjunct faculty are located here.  

5.54. No elevator.  

5.55. It is very far from mail room, meeting space, administrative offices, colleagues and faculty supervisors.  

6. **Department Adjacencies**  

6.1. Faculty, staff and students in Hills South and North are more than 1 mile from the School’s administrative offices where academic affairs, business office, and educator licensure office. Business needs to be conducted by phone, email, or drive/walk more than 1 mile.  

6.2. Space/office limitations make it very difficult to locate faculty near colleagues, research centers, graduate assistants (teaching, research, and project) and staff.  

6.3. Educator Licensure Office is for the university and includes links with SBS, HFA, NSM, PHHS.  

6.4. STEMNET links with science, mathematics, engineering, computer sciences faculty and researchers.  

6.5. ACCELA links with foreign language faculty and researchers.  

6.6. Center for Education Policy faculty work with Center for Public Policy and Administration.  

6.7. CIE – opportunity to work more closely with faculty in TECS/Furcolo, already link with departments across campus.  

6.8. Education naturally partners with all of the other Colleges and Departments. The School of Education really should be centrally located on the campus.
7. Special technology and support functions currently in use

7.1. Need teleconferencing facilities (distance learning). This is noted to be a significant deficiency at UMass that other institutions currently have and use. 3

7.2. The Instructional MAC Lab (IMAC lab) - Furcolo Room 20A, the Instructional PC lab (IPC lab) – Furcolo Room 22, the Open Student’s lab – Furcolo Room 21L, the Open Student’s lab - Hills South room 167. The scheduling procedure for these facilities are outlined in http://www.umass.edu/umassncate/ Exhibit 6.22 Technology Support. 3

8. Current Relocations or Renovations

8.1. It will be necessary to relocate from Hills South in the near future because of the deteriorating building condition. 3

9. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

9.1. Mark’s Meadow is adjacent to Furcolo Hall. If vacated by Amherst public schools, as currently proposed, potential to relocate form from Hills and Furcolo. Potential to relocate to Arnold House. 3

10. Department Space Needs

10.1. All space should be accessible and well-maintained with access to wireless service. 3

10.2. Individual offices for all full-time faculty. 3

10.3. Accessible space for all administrative functions, staff, visitors, files, technology. 3

10.4. Appropriate space for Educator Licensure Office, Educator Information Office, and Field Experience and Assessment Office including space for staff, visitors, private advising offices, computers for training and support working with electronic assessment system, files, archival space. 3

10.5. Shared office space for part-time instructors, TAs, RAs PAs and grant/project support staff. 3

10.6. Classrooms and labs near faculty offices and/or elevators in order to transport classroom materials (manipulatives for math and science education courses for example) easily. 3

10.7. Auditorium or classroom space large enough and/or appropriate (e.g. conditions, size, location) for school-wide meetings and events, and for off campus groups (state and national organizations, K-12 teachers and administrators, policy leaders, summer institutes, conferences, alumni gatherings). 3

10.8. Space for Reception areas for department chair guests and visitors. 3

10.9. Appropriate classroom space (e.g. only one classroom in Furcolo is accessible) only four university classrooms in Hill South are renovated/university classrooms and are difficult to schedule, SOE classroom space is in very poor condition. 3

10.10. Appropriate space for concentration and department wide meetings that does not compete with classes and other meetings and convenient to all departments and administrative offices. 3

10.11. Media Center to conduct research, develop online courses and provide training that is convenient to all faculty, students and classrooms. 3

10.12. Only accessible computer lab (also used for classes and workshops) is in Hills South, 1 mile from Furcolo Hall. 3

10.13. Space to conduct videotaped counseling training sessions and to lock taped session and equipment. 3

10.14. Rooms for TAs to prepare for classes, grade papers, meet with students, etc. 3

10.15. Space for RAs and PAs to work and to be located near faculty supervisors. 3

10.16. Year round, building wide air conditioning-faculty, students and project/grant support staff work year round.
10.17. Sufficient electrical access for necessary equipment, environmental controls.  
10.18. Virtual Meeting room – faculty, staff and students are working with nationwide and international colleagues.  
10.20. Secure space to store testing material (e.g. psychological testing for school psychology program).  
10.22. Space for at least 5 research centers (4 existing, one proposed) with office and meetings room.  
10.23. Space for associated faculty, students and staff to meet informally.  
10.24. Appropriate space for receptions, large presentations, meetings, etc. with outside groups.  
10.25. Meeting spaces for comprehensive exams and oral dissertation defenses.  
10.26. Adequate parking for facult, staff, students, visitors and state vehicles.  
10.27. Appropriate space to display awards, announcements, department information.  
10.28. Accessible mail, copy, printing, facsimile facility.  
10.29. Space for group processing room that holds more than 30.  
10.30. Appropriate space for all day, 2 day workshop/course sessions.  
10.31. Rooms/classrooms with observation mirrors to conduct research.  
10.32. Office and meeting space for new and existing projects/initiatives.  
10.33. Administrative space for staff and faculty administrators that is convenient to faculty, staff, and students in all departments.  
10.34. Space for technology staff to set up, test repair, update and store computers and printers.  

11. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives  
11.1. Office for Educator Licensure.  
11.2. Educator Information Office.  
11.3. Field Placement and Assessment Office.  
11.4. Center for Educational Assessment.  
11.5. Center for International Education.  
11.6. Center for Educational Policy.  
11.7. Center for School Counseling and Outreach.  
11.8. Center for School University Partnership (proposed).  
11.9. Center for Youth at Risk (proposed).  
11.10. ACCELA, STEMNET, CVSR, Equity and Excellence in Education SAREO.  

12. Department Instructional Program  
12.1. 3 departments with concentration s in each dept.  
12.3. Building partnerships with local and distance affiliates. Seeing strong application for teleconferencing.  
12.4. Much grant funding is tied to connections with local schools.
12.5. Support of high needs, at risk student/school districts in western Mass.

12.6. Foundation courses for Education students tend to be 35 to 40. As classes get more tailored they get smaller. Many undergraduate courses (general education and others) have enrollments of 100, 200 or more.

12.7. New initiatives include programs where students are studying and conducting research on-site in public schools (Springfield, Holyoke, Greenfield, etc.). Classroom space with technology so that on and off campus students/faculty can participate in the same class/activity.

13. Department Research Program

13.1. All have research relationships including students/faculty across departments.

13.2. Four research centers (CEA, CEP, CIE, CSCOR).

13.3. Potential fifth & sixth research center (school university partnerships and youth at risk).

13.4. ACCELA, STEMVET, CVSR.

13.5. Equity and Excellence in Education.


13.7. Community College Leadership Academy.

13.8. SAREO

13.9. All have or have strong potential for relationships with faculty and students in all three School of Education (EPRA, SDPPS, TECS) Departments.

13.10. CEA, CIE, CEP, CSCOR.

13.11. University school partnerships (proposed with ACCELA, STEMTEC, SAREO).

13.12. Center for university school partnerships needs office and meeting space for associated faculty and students, space for administrative staff, meetings, retreats, and workshops, videoconferences, classrooms, materials, host visitors, parking.

13.13. Center for At-Risk Youth needs office and meeting space for associated faculty and students, space for administrative staff, meetings, retreats, and workshops, videoconferences, classrooms, materials, to host visitors and parking.
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From: Joel Nordberg January 6, 2010

Subject/Project Number: School of Education

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
2 5/13/09 Information Gathering Facilities & Campus
9:30am ST02 Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
SOE – Chris McCormick, Sue Young, Linda Griffin, Cindy Hamel
EPRA – Joe Berger
SDPPS – Rich Lapan
TECS – Jerry Willett
DCAM – Ann Storer
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
   1.1. Edits were received prior to the meeting and will be incorporated. No detailed review was necessary at the meeting.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
       2.1.1. The Programs and Centers were reviewed and will be adjusted accordingly on the front sheets.
       2.1.2. Several mis-captioned photos were noted in the profiles and will be corrected in the next round.
       2.1.3. SDPPS Needs:
           2.1.3.1. 1 On 1 Counseling room, Group Counseling for up to 10 people, training rooms set up for assessment testing and video (working with children), a dedicated space for social justice group experience sessions, research center for (new) Center for School Counseling Outcome (office scale), project team room large enough for a central conf. table and 4 touch-down stations.
2.1.3.2. Various other room classifications were noted and will be corrected on the next round.

2.1.4. EPRA Needs:
   2.1.4.1. Programs were reviewed and additions noted.
   2.1.4.2. There is an opportunity to share spaces. A meeting room large enough for the entire faculty, they always have at least 1 visiting international scholars who need an office,
   2.1.4.3. Other corrections and edits were noted on the faculty and room classifications.

2.1.5. TECS Needs:
   2.1.5.1. The listing of concentration is incomplete and needs to be included on the profile front sheet.
   2.1.5.2. The need for accessibility in Furcolo was stressed as was their need for the use of teaching props and materials which need to be transported within and outside of the building.
   2.1.5.3. A heavy need was noted for conference rooms and hub identities for each concentration. Also: curriculum research space, expanded file, video & general storage. The work stations should be relocated out of the open stack library area.

2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.2.1. Confusion still remained over faculty and staff. SOE will mark-up a roster and provide out-side of the meeting

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
   3.1. Growth projections were reviewed and will be discussed further with the Provost

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings is severe)
   4.2. Campus location: is less than ideal as noted in the first meetings

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:
   No specific discussions

6. Outline next steps:
   A review meeting will be scheduled with the Dean after the next profile updates have occurred.
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From: Joel Nordberg

January 6, 2010

Subject/Project Number: School of Education

Dean Review

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 3
Meeting Date: 7/21/09
9:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering

Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: SOE – Chris McCormick, Sue Young, Linda Griffin
EPRA – Joe Berger
SDPPS – Rich Lapan
TECS – Jerry Willett
DCAM – Ann Storer
UMass F&CP- Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova
Burt Hill- Carol Harris, Joel Nordberg

Distribution: Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. SOE Dean’s Office
   1.1. Objection was noted to the “good” rating for Furcolo due to the lose ceiling tile problems and asbestos adhesive.
   1.2. There was also discussion across all departments there are a large number of grant positions funded through the College and Deans office that should be assigned to the departments.
   1.3. Existing and rightsized space use was reviewed with minor comments and adjustments noted.
   1.4. Department chairs and Deans should also have a faculty office.
   1.5. Stressed that licensing functions serve the University at large and are not specific to SOE

2. SDPPS
   2.1. Several corrections were noted in the front profile text.
   2.2. A number of programs are mislabeled as Concentrations.
   2.3. It was felt that more space is needed in the rightsizing for Centers, Journals and Grad Student offices.
   2.4. Adjustments are need as noted above for graduate student offices currently showing under the Dean.
   2.5. The Education Licensing office is a University (not a EPRA) office.
2.6. There are staff office needs in the department that are not recognized due to some positions being listed under the office of the Provost. SOE will provide further guidance.

3. EPRA
   3.1. Minor edits were noted to the Profile front text.
   3.2. Adjustments will be made for space needs funded through the Dean’s office as noted above.
   3.3. There are classified grant staff positions that do not show up on the personnel list. SOE will advise.

4. TECS
   4.1. Objections (as noted above) to Good condition of Furcolo.
   4.2. Modifications were noted in the Program, concentrations and degrees.
   4.3. Notes were also taken regarding which programs require specific space.
   4.4. Stressed need for resource storage and transport for specialized teaching methods.
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From: Joel E. Nordberg

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts
Film Studies

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1  Meeting Date: 4/7/09 2:00 – 3:30
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Herter Annex

Meeting Purpose:
Film Studies, Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:
Film Studies, Catherine Portuges, Director
CHFA, Joanne Dolan – Dean’s Office
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing,
Michael Reagan

1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
      1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
      1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
      1.3.3. Department location plans.
      1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
      1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
      2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Since its inception in 1991, Film Studies has become a dynamic center of interdepartmental and interdisciplinary activity. With active participation from a solid core of more than twenty faculty members, representing fifteen departments from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, the School of Behavioral and Social Sciences, and the School of Education, the Program offers an undergraduate Certificate Program in Film Studies which enrolls approximately 200 students from twenty-eight different majors; 800 additional students have successfully completed the program since the fall of 1991. The Program has received national recognition from independent sources such as the Eastman-Kodak Corporation (1993, 1995, and 1999) for “academic excellence in support of the future generation of filmmakers.”

3.2. Our graduates go on to distinguish themselves as scholars, artists, and professionals in the demanding and competitive areas of film and video. Recently, members of our faculty have received grants from foundations such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities, the Getty Foundation and AMC Cinemas, as well as numerous Faculty Research Grants, Distinguished Teaching Awards, and other distinctions.

3.3. The Interdepartmental Program in Film Studies engages in a variety of film and video-related activities that benefit students and the larger academic community, including:

3.3.1. Coordination and description of film courses on campus and the five colleges, offering approximately 80 courses at UMass and 70-80 at the other 4 colleges per year

3.3.2. Regular film and video screenings

3.3.3. Speaker’s series’ colloquia and retrospectives on the work of international filmmakers and videographers

3.3.4. Availability of filmmaking equipment and facilities for teaching and research on campus

3.3.5. The Massachusetts Multicultural Film Festival held in the spring semester

3.3.6. The Michael S. Roif Award in Film Studies: a competitive annual prize awarded to students enrolled in the Program whose film, video, or moving-image-media work demonstrates exceptional creativity and accomplishment

3.3.7. A current resource archive of videocassettes and journals, reference materials on film and video programs, institutes, and other educational opportunities in the U.S. and Canada, internships, practica, film festivals and student screenwriting, film and video competitions.

3.4. Film studies is an Interdepartmental Program under both HFA & SBS. The Director, Catherine Portuges is also Language, Literature and Cultures faculty.

3.5. The program offers a Certificate in Film Studies to UMass students in conjunction with their departmental major.

3.6. The Program supports and coordinates with any film studies need, campus wide, but mostly in SBS & HFA.

3.7. The program was considered for space in the FAC building but was cut out of the plan.

1 Information excerpted from Film Studies Website.
4. Department Headcount (Population)
   4.1. Film Studies has 19 adjunct faculty members, including the Director, from across many departments. They also have an advisor, a half time secretary, 8 Intern Students and occasionally a TA. 1
   4.2. Approximately 250 students are enrolled in their Certificate program.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions
   5.1. The Department is in good space in the Herter Annex but the administrative offices are cut off from the seminar room by the Herter Gallery, forcing people to go outside to get between spaces.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)
   6.1. Their central location on campus is good. They are close to Herter and programs such as DEFA and the Fine Arts Center (Theater, Art & Music), University Gallery in FAC.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations
   7.1. Interest in TV studio in basement. They need a multimedia room where they would have open access.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
   8.1. None noted.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
   9.1. They need a central space for private meetings and student advising.
   9.2. No facilities of their own for DVD transfers.
   9.3. There is no central film screening room. They sometimes use space in the School of Management.
   9.4. There is a need for portable DVD and audio equipment.
   9.5. They also need black-out capabilities for their conference room windows when using the space for film viewing.
   9.6. They lend out their conference room to other groups, mostly from Herter.
   9.7. Additional file and support space is also needed.
   9.8. A large screening room is needed. It should seat from 50 to 75 people.
   9.9. An intermediate scale screening room with seating for between 15 & 30 is also needed.
   9.10. They are constantly working around the 50 minute schedule block which does not work at all for film viewing.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives
    10.1. Massachusetts Multicultural Film Festival.
    10.2. Trying to coordinate all Film resources for other programs.
    10.3. Michael S. Rolf Prize for annual
    10.4. Film festival in SOM 140. Need a screen.

11. Department Instructional Program
    11.1. More information is needed.

12. Department Research Program
    12.1. More information is needed.
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From: Carol Harris

June 4, 2009

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts

Film Studies

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/21/09
11:00

Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

ST02

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
CHFA- Ron Michaud, Joanne Dolan
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
   1.1. None noted.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
       2.1.1. The current location in Herter is not ideal given lighting and room configuration, but the program makes do with the existing facilities and size.
   2.2. Population & Personnel List
       2.2.1. Staff includes: 1 director, 1 part-time staff, 1 fulltime grad student.
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:
       2.3.1. Large and medium sized screening rooms are needed for the program, but they do not need to be dedicated Film Studies spaces and could be shared with other departments.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs
   3.1. Reception and waiting spaces are very needed; none exist now.
3.2. Dedicated Advising space and Offices for staff are needed.

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)
       4.1.1. In order to create a more cohesive program, Film Studies spaces should be in proximity to each other
               and screening rooms (if they are shared with other departments).
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.
       4.2.1. DEFA (East German film collection) is currently housed in the German department.
       4.2.2. Foreign Language Film Festival

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation
   5.1. Would move to be closer to other associated programs.

6. Outline next steps
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**From:** Joel E. Nordberg  
**April 25, 2009**

**Subject/Project Number:** College of Humanities and Fine Arts  
Translation Center

- New Academic Classroom Facilities  
- University of Massachusetts – Amherst  
- Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1  
- Burt Hill Project 08825.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Number</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/12/09</td>
<td>Information 4</td>
<td>South College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>ST02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Purpose:**  
Translation Center, Space Use

**Attendees:**  
- Translation Center - Edwin Gentzler, Director  
- HFA - Ron Michaud, Associate Dean  
- UMass - F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova  
- DCAM - Ann Storer  
- Burt Hill - Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg

**Distribution:**  
- Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan

**Comments:**

1. **Purpose**  
   1.1. Tour department space.  
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.  
   1.3. Address the following topics:  
       1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.  
       1.3.2. Findings from building tours.  
       1.3.3. Department location plans.  
       1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations  
       1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. **Project Overview**  
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. The Translation Center at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst is a unique enterprise that combines business services with academics. By keeping up with the latest in training and research, we find that we can offer higher quality translations to our clients.

In sum, the Translation Center blends academics and service in a dynamic fashion that keeps the Center on the cutting edge of the field. Research influences training, which in turn impacts service, and vice versa. All combine to improve the skills of our translators, who then can better serve our clients and meet your communication needs.  

3.2. The UMass Translation Center offers an array of translation, interpreting and language consulting services to a variety of clients: small businesses, multinational corporations, museums, law firms, hospitals, NGOs, filmmakers, advertising firms, educational institutions ranging from elementary schools to university departments, and individuals, to name a few.

Our clients return thanks to the quality of our translators and interpreters, our ability to provide translation services in over 80 languages, and our competitive prices. With the academic influence of the University and the Translation Studies backgrounds of our graduate students and director, our attentiveness to subtleties gives us an edge. Our translators and project managers demonstrate a sense of ownership of the jobs they undertake and are ready to accommodate the requirements of each project.  

3.3. The demand for advanced study in translation and interpreting is growing. The trend towards globalization is continuing to open up new markets, providing multilingual job opportunities for translation professionals in numerous fields. Businesses and governments are increasingly looking to hire professionals with cross-cultural communication skills as well as experience in translation and interpreting.  

3.4. At the UMass Translation Center, we provide a Master of Arts in Translation Studies, Interpreting certificate programs, as well as Graduate and Undergraduate classes in translation and interpreting.  

3.5. The Translation Center is a College Center in CHFA.

3.6. The TC was previously located on the 4th floor of Herter with Spanish. When the Foreign Language Research Center left, the TC went to the basement of the Herter Annex to get more space.

3.7. They are attracting international candidates of very high caliber to the program.

3.8. A pool of 500 translators (faculty, spouses and graduate students) are engaged on a paid per contract basis.

3.9. Students get real world experience with real clients.

3.10. The TC was founded in the 1980s. It is thought to be among the top 5 or 3 in translation services in the Country. The center has been a revenue generator. There is a similar but larger program in Binghamton.

3.11. Dr. Gentzler teaches translation and also teaches in the Comparative Literature program.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. 15 Students, limited by number of stations. Drawing from all 5 Colleges. They could take more students with more faculty and space.
4.2. Full time administrative assistant, full time director. Half time IT person. 3.5 total staff/faculty.

4.3. They also use adjunct faculty form other language programs.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. All space is on the Basement level of the Herter Annex. The space is a windowless basement, dirty, with mice and no ventilation.

5.2. The Center is in direct contact with corporate clients and international exchanges. The space is a poor reflection on the University as these guests and clients come in.

5.3. They have upkeep issues with shoveling, repairs, leaks, etc.

5.4. The Communication Department television studio is next to their space and has an interest in expanding into TC’s space if they were to relocate. The technology in the Television room could also be utilized by the TC in their multimedia translation work if Communications were to relocate. The industry is moving into mass/multi media.

5.5. Their reception area is the nerve center for the department and has already expanded beyond the limits of the space.

5.6. They have 3 super computers in their lab.

5.7. They use interpreting booths and a recording studio regularly in their work.

6. Department Adjacencies

6.1. LL&C, & other language programs.

6.2. Other programs have connections to technical writing, business, etc.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None discussed.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. They absolutely want to relocate out of the Basement.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. They are under served compared to other facilities abroad which have much more high tech equipment and resources such as specialty libraries, etc.

9.2. They are hoping to grow both the student education program and translation service program.

9.3. Developing competency in translation at the professional level is an extremely meticulous process requiring high level resources.

9.4. Demand is very high for translators. Other countries are expanding their programs at a much higher rate than in the US. The UMass program has maxed out their current resources.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. Because of specialty needs, the translation process has become a team effort involving technical specialist from areas such as medicine and engineering.

10.2. The UMass Center hosted the American Institute of Translation Consultants Conference this year.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. They have an on line (Comp Lit.) program.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. Not specifically discussed. More information is needed.
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Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts
Translation Center

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/27/09
Meeting Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: ST02

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:
Translation Center- Edwin Gentzler
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova, Pam Rooney
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

      2.1.1. The condition of the Translation Center’s space in Herter is poor. There are severe leak problems in NW corner. The amount of work needed and the amount of funds required for renovation is so great that no repairs are being done.

      2.1.2. The Translation Center runs language labs that can teach languages and interpreting w/multi-media. Will share Herter #15 w/LLC.

      2.1.3. Herter #15 is used as a language lab; #17 is a translation lab; #17A is used as graduate student offices.

      2.1.4. Room #19B is used as an audio sound booth & computer repair.
2.1.5. Technical and electrical upgrades to support the equipment required for translation is needed. The current condition of the facility does not support the higher quality equipment used.

2.1.6. The Director’s office is in #19D. Room #19E is shared by the asst. director and the head project manager. Room #19C is used for interpreting studies.

2.1.7. The mezzanine is used for storage.

### 2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.2.1. The center has accepted (7) MA students for fall ’09. (3) are international students coming for a 1 year MA degree.

2.2.2. The center does not offer an undergraduate degree but there is a demand. It does have 6-10 graduate students.

2.2.3. The center supports 1 work study student and a few interns. 3 stations are required for student employees.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. The program successfully uses UMass classrooms in Herter. Designated seminar space for the program is not required.

### 3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. The center needs a state of the art interpretation lab for 30 people @ 40sf/station. A renovation of existing space that accommodates 24 people has been proposed for the Herter #15 language lab. The classroom/lab space should have technical equipment necessary for translations and video editing. The furniture should be moveable and have individual interpreting units. The lab would promote group and interactive work.

3.2. The Translation Center is a profit generator and needs a presentable reception area.

3.3. Translators are needed now and there is demand to get into program. There are 50-60 applicants with only 7 acceptances. Funding and faculty ability is the deciding factor for the size of the center.

3.4. The center does have need for more translation rooms: Rooms #19F and 19G that are currently assigned to the Communications Department could satisfy this need.

3.5. Audio recording spaces need sound attenuation.

### 4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.1.1. Currently the Communications Department has to go through Translation Center rooms to get to their spaces in rooms #19F and 19G. This is a security problem and is disruptive to the functions of the center.

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

4.2.1. The language lab in Herter #15 is used by Communications students.

### 5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

5.1. The Translation Center takes business in from around Massachusetts and is not just a university service. It is a profit center and would benefit from locating it in a more prominent space on campus (as would the university). The center does need to be accessible to the public and does not necessary need to be located on campus.
MEETING MINUTES

From: Emily Santilli

April 25, 2009

Subject/Project Number:

College of Humanities and Fine Arts
Afro-American Studies

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
1 3/13/09 1:00 – 2:30 Information Gathering ST02 New Africa House

Meeting Purpose:

Afro-American Studies, Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:

Afro-American Studies, Amilcar Shabazz – Chair
CHFA, Ron Michaud – Associate Dean
UMass, Ludmilla Pavlova – F&CP
DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background Information

3.1. The W. E. B. Du Bois Department of Afro-American Studies is one of the largest such departments in the country, offering an undergraduate major for all students who wish in-depth knowledge of the history and culture of Black people in Africa and the New World. The course of study is interdisciplinary with courses in African and Afro-American history, art, political science, and literature. Students in our Department have the opportunity to participate in a variety of on- and off-campus learning situations. The training and experience of the faculty provides a perspective on the history, culture, and place in the world of Africans and Afro-Americans that differs markedly from that of the traditional disciplines. This approach to the study of humanity offers a better understanding of the totality of human experience. Our highly selective doctoral program seeks to reproduce both the scholarship and the social commitment of Du Bois in a new generation of scholars who will carry into the twenty-first century the work that Du Bois accomplished in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Rigorously trained by us in the highest ideals and most advanced techniques of scholarship, our students are urged to carry that scholarship out of the academy and into the world, for the good of the community and the nation. We endeavor to produce well-trained scholars who will bring a unique fusion of cross-disciplinary scholarship and social commitment to their own colleges and universities, and to the communities in which they live.

3.2. New Africa House used to be an interracial dormitory during the late 60s. A small issue between an African American student and a White student ballooned to the point where the African American students asked the White students to leave the dorm for fear of hate crimes. The University did not want to create an all African American dorm, so they made the building a home for African American Studies.

3.3. Large General Ed courses typically 100-200 students, capped based on large classroom availability.

3.4. Caps of 45 or 50 on upper level courses.

3.5. P.U.M.A. (Program for Undergraduate Mentoring and Advising) – Has office and meeting space. Some TAs work more exclusively with PUMA than others (up to 12).

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Assoc Professor U of M 3, Asst Professor U of M 1, Chairman of Department A 1, Clerks 2, Graduate Fellowships 4, Graduate Research Assistant 2, Graduate Teaching Assistants 5, Lecturer A U of M 1, Lecturer U of M 1, Professor U of M 4, Student Employee 1; totaling 25.

4.2. Core FT Faculty of 12 including chair and 1 emeritus faculty member.

4.3. 1 visiting faculty member: African American Philosophy

4.4. African American Music and Art are no longer a part of African American Studies.

4.5. Approx. 2,000 students from larger university population take courses offered through Afro-American Studies.

4.6. They currently have 20 majors, 12 minors, 33 graduate students

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Afro-American Studies occupies 6,147 nsf all in the 3rd and 4th floors of Mills/New Africa House.

5.2. Building lacks an elevator, though UMass plans to retrofit are in place and scheduled to begin this summer.

---

1 Information excerpted from LLC Website.
2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records
5.3. Room 422 – an old Radio Station is not currently being used.
5.4. Lack of wireless internet is an issue. Seminar rooms are not “Smart” classrooms.

6. Department Adjacencies
6.1. Library (DuBois papers), History, Anthropology, Music, Art, Latin American Studies

7. Special technology and support functions currently in use
7.1. Computers and “Smart” Classrooms

8. Relocations or renovations
8.1. Program would not mind being more centrally located (such as the Chapel or Library), though they have an established identity and history in their current location.

9. Department Space Needs
9.1. Office space to start an electronic journal, much like the printed journals from African American Studies in the past.
9.2. Large classroom space to teach larger entry level courses (Entry level courses are typically filled by upperclassmen before freshmen can register). Access to larger classrooms could support more of the campus population demand.
9.3. The Department is fairly happy in their location. They feel the registrar gives them first pick of the NAH classrooms scheduled by UMass.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives
10.1. Surveying the development of African American studies around the world.
10.2. Fulbright Scholar as part of the program

11. Department Instructional Program
11.1. None noted.

12. Department Research Program
12.1. None noted.
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College of Humanities and Fine Arts
African-American Studies

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/27/09
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
Afro-Am Studies, Chair- Amilcar Shabazz
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova, Pam Rooney
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the Meeting Minutes #1
1.1. No revisions noted.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

2.1.1. A new elevator is to be installed in Mills House. The mail room #104 provides service for the entire building and will be removed when the new elevator is installed. This square footage is to be removed from Afro-Am area counts. Room #314 will also be eliminated by the elevator project.

2.1.2. Room #101C that is labeled as office space is part of the Art Gallery and not Afro-Am.

2.1.3. Room #419 is used as an office for a visiting professor. This office will be moved to the 3rd floor by the fall of ’09.

2.1.4. The Horace Mann Education Center is a program sponsored by the Afro-American Studies department and is located in room #426.
2.1.5. Undergraduate mentoring is located in room #418. The mentoring program hires graduate students that are paid through the Provost’s office. This would change the count of graduate employees to an estimated 30 students.

2.1.6. Room #’s 421 and 423 are used by TA’s.

2.1.7. Lecturers for the Afro-American department have private offices.

2.1.8. Room #316 will be the grad student lounge.

2.1.9. Room #411 was at one time a computer lab but is now labeled as a Study. It is being used for the PUMA undergraduate mentoring program. It has also been used for interview space by a videographer.

2.1.10. Room #311 holds 46 people and is useful to the department. A larger capacity room is also needed.

2.1.11. The department uses seminar space for 20-30 students. Conference rooms are used as seminar space.

2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. Room #320 is the break room. The copier is used by the whole building, not just Afro-Am Studies. A 200sf space may be more appropriate since the copier serves more than one department.

2.3.2. The department has an estimated 1,000sf of storage space. This amount of storage space is needed since it houses collections and historical material. It may be more appropriately labeled as library or archive space.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

3.1. Since Mills House is located in a remote part of campus, dedicated classroom space in the building would be useful. Currently, the department has priority of UMass classrooms #110 and 114.

3.2. The department is planning on offering larger classes of 50 students. Some classes have the potential to attract up to 75-100 students.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

4.2.1. Mills House is not near central campus or many of the classrooms used for teaching Afro-Am Studies.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

5.1. In general African American Studies likes Mills House as a department home.

6. Outline next steps
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Subject/Project Number:

College of Humanities and Fine Arts
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New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
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Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
1 Revised 3/13/09 Information Gathering South College
9:15 – 10:30 ST02

Art, Architecture & Art History – Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:

UMass Art, Arch, Art History: William Oedel, Art Chair
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova
UMass HFA: Ron Michaud, Associate Dean
Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan
UMass F&CP: Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM: Ann Storer
Burt Hill: Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg –

1. Meeting Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:
  • Existing and proposed population.
  • Findings from building tours.
  • Department location plans.
  • Current and potential department relocations and renovations
  • Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
  • Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
• Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. **Department Background information**

3.1. Department is comprised of three divisions: Studio Arts, Architectural Design, and Art History.

3.2. **Bachelor of Fine Arts in Studio Art:**

- the Studio Arts Program offers a broad view of contemporary art that is both innovative and experimental. The program begins with a foundations year that provides a rigorous grounding in interdisciplinary art making.
- Disciplines with in the Studio Arts Program: Animation, Art Education, Ceramics, Digital Media (Still Imagery and Time Based), Painting, Photography, Printmaking, Sculpture.
- Disciplines consist of thematic groupings of select courses offered throughout the Department of Art, Architecture and Art History and the Five College Consortium.
- Courses in Art Education provide students with a strong background in studio work and the necessary courses in education in order to be certified as an art teacher in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (elementary or secondary levels). Because of the national reputation of the Art and Education Departments of the University of Massachusetts, graduates in Art Education are in a very strong position for employment.

3.3. **Bachelor of Fine Arts in Design:**

- This degree provides students broad exposure to aspects of building and material science as well as a variety of cultural, environmental and historic perspectives, preparing them to make innovative and integrated contributions as architects and designers.
- The B.F.A. in Design Program / Architectural Track includes a sequence of studios and support courses that focus on architecture as both an art form and a professional path. The studios emphasize process, inventive analysis and discovery. As students work on a variety of design problems, their analytical, conceptual and practical skills are further developed so that they can respond to the complex needs of the built environment. Professional electives in engineering, physics, architectural history and urbanism support the studio courses.
- The Architecture+Design Program is home to New England’s first and only public Master of Architecture program that has been fully accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB).

3.4. **Departmental Foundations courses** introduce students to the fundamentals of drawing, color theory, two and three dimensional art as well as introductory design courses. The foundations curriculum exposes students to many forms of design and artistic expression, encouraging them to experiment before entering the Architectural Studies Program.

3.5. **Foundations Studio**

- A year-long course designed to introduce students to the materials, techniques, language, concepts and processes of making, using and thinking about Art. Unlike many other art courses, Foundations Studio is an experience where learning comes not only from the projects and their results but also from the interaction among the entire group of students - actions, opinions and participation of fellow students becomes an important part of the art experience and learning.

1 Information excerpted from the Art’s Website.
The basic premise of Foundations Studio is twofold:
First, this course explores art and design as an experimental practice where invention and investigation play essential roles. Instead of considering introductory level art/design merely as a discipline for producing “solutions” to problems, students will engage in a process of rich qualitative research and reflection.

Second, the principal context for this course is current practices in contemporary art/design, which is a vast arena of diverse styles, techniques, materials, subjects, forms, purposes, and aesthetic traditions. Thus developing a “foundation” in art and design entails developing an awareness of contemporary art-making practices, which in turn reflects the major changes of thinking in both art and society in recent years. Through rigorous formal experimentation in two and three dimensions and examining the terms and concepts of visual artists, students will be challenged to create imaginative and open responses to the question of how s/he connects visually to the world at large.

The course aims to keep a healthy tension and balance between formal concepts, hands-on skills, imagination, and critical thinking. In addition to the studio practice, lectures, readings, and visits to museums and galleries provides a framework for understanding contemporary practice in art and design.

3.6. Bachelor of Arts in Art History

- The Art History Program is the one of two at a public institution in New England (the other at UConn) that offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees. Our emphasis is on the cultures of Western Europe, North America, and Islam. Opportunities to take classes at the Four Colleges—Smith, Amherst, Mount Holyoke, and Hampshire—expand credited coursework to include the art of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The University’s location in the heart of New England enables easy access to a wide variety of collections, monuments, and historical sites in the Northeast. Visits to and research at institutions from Boston to New York are an integral part of the Program.

- The discipline of Art History examines visual culture and the built environment within their social and historical contexts. Degrees in Art History (B.A. and M.A.) provide students with a solid foundation in the history of western art and architecture from the ancient world to the present, as well as a background in non-Western artistic traditions. Students learn not only how to analyze works of art as objects or monuments in their own right, but also to understand and interpret them in relation to the historical circumstances, endeavors, and conflicts of the culture and region in which they were made. With its broad emphasis on culture and history and its focus on writing, analysis, and research, Art History is an excellent liberal arts degree for students seeking flexible but rigorous training for a variety of careers. A degree in Art History not only prepares students to work in arts-related fields, but also fosters the kinds of skills necessary in any profession involving visual culture in its broadest sense, historical and cultural understanding, critical analysis, persuasive argumentation, thorough research, and effective writing.

3.7. The purpose of the Master of Arts Program in Art History is to provide a course of study for advanced art history students that will allow them to develop a high degree of professional competence and a broad foundation for further work in the discipline.

- Enrollment in the Program does not exceed 30 students. There are presently 7 full-time art history faculty on the Amherst campus. This small size and advantageous student/faculty ratio give the Program many strengths. Founded in 1969, the M.A. Program offers 1 of 2 publicly-funded graduate art history degree in New England. We prepare students for doctoral study and provide professional training for many careers, including museum and historical society...
work, governmental programs in the arts, the art market, journalism, and teaching at all levels.

3.8. 3/12/09 announcement: Landscape Architecture will be moved from NRE to HFA.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Administrative Analyst I, 1; Undesignated, 9; Asst Professor U of M, 5; Chairman of Department A, 1; Clerk III, 1; Clerk IV, 2; Graduate Research Assistant, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 21; Graduate Teaching Associate, 13; Undesignated, 1; Lecturer U of M, 14; Professor U of M, 13; Senior Lecturer U of M, 1; Student Employee, 26; Technical Assistant II, U of M, 2; Technical Specialist I, U of M, 2; Totaling 113.  

4.2. 31 full time faculty.

4.3. 325 majors across the 3 programs

4.4. 75 to 100 grad students.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Art occupies 61,959 nsf (5,033 sf in Bartlett, 3,346 sf in Clark, 24,376 sf in Fine Arts Center, 2,153 sf in Herter and 27,051 sf in the Studio Arts Building).

5.2. Program space summary

- **Art:**
  
  5.2.1. The majority of Art space has moved to the New Studio Art Building (SAB) fall 2008. The new building has been well received and is a tremendous resource.

  5.2.2. FAC 3 – Chair, faculty and staff offices, conference, reception, archives and Foundation Director.

  5.2.3. FAC 4 – offices for Art Education faculty offices, Center for Research in Art, Tech & Animation (445), sound rooms (446), Animation classroom (447), and art studio (448).

  5.2.4. FAC 445: CRAT – initially funded by substantial grants in late 1990’s to develop digital and animation capabilities. Prof Galvis Assmus

  5.2.5. Bartlett – Art has vacated basement storage space (49, 51, 53, 53b, 55, 57, 15B).

  5.2.6. Clark Hall – studios for Art faculty, subdivided for 4 new grad students.

- **Architecture**

  5.2.1. FAC 4 – 7 teaching studios, 5 office (Architecture faculty offices are combined office and studio space)

  5.2.2. FAC 3 – 2 offices and copy/mail room.

  5.2.3. FAC 429, 430, 431 – Initially planned to move to the SAB, the Foundation class has three dedicated classrooms (25 students each).

  5.2.4. FAC 432 is a multi-purpose studio serving architecture, art, and art education.

  5.2.5. FAC 465 – double office for slide room

- **Art History**

  5.2.1. Bartlett Basement - Storage Room

---

2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
5.2.2. Bartlett 2 – Art faculty officers (229 A, B), TA (229C) and storage, copy, archive room (229D).

5.2.3. Bartlett 2 – Art History slide library (221, 225, and 227) includes library, storage, and Director office. This space should be assigned to the Library and not Art History. Digitizing art history slide library is in process.

- The entire 9th floor of DuBois is Art Collections.

5.2.4. Bartlett 3 – Main office and faculty offices, TA space, red lounge.

6. Department Adjacencies / Neighborhoods

6.1. The programs of Art, Architecture and Art History share many classes and space types and are appropriately joined as one department.

6.2. Art and Architecture share freshman foundation program and are closely linked programmatically.

6.3. Landscape Architecture will be joining another college and needs to relocate from Hills.

7. Technology and support functions

7.1. 444 - Computer Lab

- Background: Art negotiated with OIT to provide computers for labs with agreement Art would share lab with non Art students on campus that needed graphic capability. The initial computer set up allowed architecture and animation to utilize the lab. When OIT converted stations to a Mac platform, Architecture and Animation were no longer able to use their software and consequently now travel to DuBois 16 for cad workstations.

- The Mac platforms has restricted use by Art and Architecture and at this time is no longer used by the department. The space is still assigned to Art. The use of the space has dropped.

- It is now possible to install a hybrid platform, which has not been adopted by OIT.

- Due to budget cuts Art has stopped funding for the room and would like to discontinue the arrangement and re-use the room for a dedicated architecture cad studio.

- The work stations are used by Music and Theater.

- Due to the fact that Mac computers are not compatible with architectural software, the architectural computer classes are taught in the 16th floor of DuBois.

- Sorting this out requires senior administration negotiations better OIT and HFA.

- There is a new Mac Lab in the SAB that meets Studio Arts needs.

8. Current Relocations/ Renovations

8.1. Discussions of FAC 4th floor exhaust improvements.

9. Proposed Relocations / Renovations

9.1. Art: consolidation of Art Animation (439) with 445 (CRAT); Room 439 has been re-assigned to Architecture. Challenges will be creating a light and dark space in one studio.

9.2. Printmaking has been moved to SAB. All remaining printmaking in FAC needs to be removed so space can be reallocated.

9.3. Architecture: Architectural faculty in office on the 3rd floor, would be better suited on the 4th floor.

10. Department Space Needs

10.1. Art
• Art Education (458 – office and 460 research room) currently shares the multi purpose classroom 432 and needs a dedicated class space for Art Education.

• Storage space in the SAB. The consolidation of Studio Arts into the new SAB resulted in less space than when previously decentralized (wonderful new space, but less of it). Storage for art materials is a problem and needs to be address. This could be handled in buildings near by. Studio Arts Building is working well but is already small mostly due to the lack of storage.

• Art programs remaining in the FAC.

10.1.1. Due to budget constraints 3 Art Education disciplines were not able to relocated and remained behind in the Fine Arts Building including:
  • Animation Studio and sound rooms
  • The Center for Research in Art & Technology, 439
  • Foundation studios, 429, 430, 431.

• Clark faculty studio space

10.2. Architecture

• Studio space currently in flux. With the opening of the SAB and the relocation of printmaking, the vacated space was reassigned to the department of Art, Architecture and Art History.

10.2.1. Removal of old print making equipment and hoods is expensive and requires abatement. Old ventilated hoods, sinks, and equipment remain and hinder the ability to use the studios.

10.2.2. Studio space in general is antiquated and extensive renovations required to upgrade.

• The undergrad and graduate architecture have seen a dramatic increase in applications.

10.2.1. In the New England area UMass is the only public institution providing architectural undergrad and accredited graduate programs.

10.2.2. Currently 135 undergrads. Master program has grown from 4-40 in two years. They would like to grow to 70.

• To accommodate this growth, Architecture would like renovate the 4th floor, including the office wing. The space needs to be upgraded and fitted out for architectural studio specific purposes.

10.2.1. Action: Study team to review Architectural proposal for renovations to the 4th floor.

• Architecture needs a PC platform computer lab adjacent to them in FAC.

• Dedicated space to meet the National Architectural Accreditation Board requirements.

10.3. Art History

• The program had dedicated rooms with special features (double projector, room darkeners) fitted out by Art History and lost to the Registrar; the department would like these back.

11. Department Initiatives

11.1. Expand Architecture program, currently constrained by space limitations.

11.2. Any replacement or new hires put on hold?

12. Department Instructional Program

12.1. Wood shop – currently under utilized for teaching due to faculty cut backs.
12.2. Photography – classes restricted by cost of chemicals & size of lab (14 stations).

12.3. SAB – many class sizes are smaller in the new building than in the old facility and impact reduces classes for minors and severely restricting non art majors, turn away a large number students. Example of program reductions

- Figure modeling – was 20, new space accommodates 16 students
- Wood – was 12, now can accommodate 8 students
- Metal – was 10 -15, now 8 -9 students

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.
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MEETING MINUTES

From: Carol Harris  
December 10, 2009

Subject/Project Number:
College of Humanities and Fine Arts
Art, Architecture and Art History

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2  
Meeting Date: 5/06/09 9:30am  
Project Phase: Information Gathering  
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:
Art, Architecture & Art History, Chair- William Oedel
CHFA, Assistant Dean - Ron Michaud
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:
      2.3.1. The department chair has a dedicated ‘chair’ office in FAC. The current chair teaches in the Art History program and also has an academic office in Bartlett.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
   3.1. If Architecture were to grow, the program would need to add faculty as well as gain additional space.
   3.2. See attachment for Architecture space needs.
   3.3. Art History needs proximity to its slide library. If move the slide library to the Dubois Library it would be extremely inconvenient for the program while the slides are still in use.

4. Review Location Considerations:
4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL

/s/

December 10, 2009
FAC Bridge Program
Integrated Architecture + Arts

Architecture + Design Assumptions
BFA Design enrollment
45 sophomores
45 juniors
45 seniors
135 total

M.Arch + MS enrollment
15 first year
30 second year
30 third year
75 total

BFA Design juniors and seniors, and M.Arch must take studios (with dedicated seats) each semester. Maximum enrollment is 15 students. Minimum space per student is 70.

Program
Studios
Studios with dedicated workstation.
Each studio = 15 x 70 = 1000 SF
Each semester need 11 dedicated studios (6undergrad, 5 grad).

Other studios (share with Foundations)
Assume 2 studios at 1000

Computing/Digital Fabrication
Computing and printing, 1000 SF
Digital fabrication, 2000 SF
Research, 1000 SF

Resource Room 1000 SF
Review Space/Jury/Multiuse Space 2000 SF

20,000 SF net
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg

Revised December 9, 2009 April 25, 2009

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts Classics

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
1 Revised 3/12/09 Information Gathering South College
9:00 -10:00 ST02

Meeting Purpose: Classics, Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:
UMass Classics: Lisa Marie Smith Ann Storer, Ludmilla
UMass HFA: Ron Michaud Associate Dean Pavlova, Alex Wing,
UMass F&CP: Ludmilla Pavlova Michael Reagan
DCAM: Ann Storer
Burt Hill: Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose
1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   • Existing and proposed population.
   • Findings from building tours.
   • Department location plans.
   • Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   • Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
   • Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
   • Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.
2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. The Classics Department was founded over thirty years ago to provide undergraduate and graduate students with access to the rich and diverse civilizations of the ancient Greeks and Romans.¹

3.2. Faculty have national and international reputations, particularly in Latin and Greek literature, Latin pedagogy, classical archaeology, and classical folklore. Faculty members are highly engaged in undergraduate teaching and advising. Nearly all classes are taught by faculty rather than by graduate students.¹

3.3. The department has a very nationally regarded graduate program offering a Master of Arts in Teaching Latin and Classical Humanities. MAT graduates teach Latin in secondary schools all over the country and introduce the ancient western world to new generations of students. The Classics Department provides the environment of a small liberal arts college within the context of a large state university.¹

3.4. Classics has a strong Classics Honors Program, and our majors regularly produce outstanding senior honors theses and projects. Many students also participate in Eta Sigma Phi, the national classics undergraduate honor society.

3.5. 9 new student transfers have come into the degree program.

3.6. Anticipating higher admittance demand in the future.

3.7. Eta Sigma Phi is the national honorary society for students of Latin, Greek, and/or Classics. The purposes of the society, in the words of the Constitution, are “to develop and promote interest in classical study among the students of colleges and universities; to promote closer relationships among student interested in such study; to engage generally in an effort to stimulate interest in classical studies, and in the history, art and literature of ancient Greece and Rome.”¹

3.8. The Department of Classics strongly encourages students to participate in experiential learning programs related to Classics and Classical Antiquity. This training not only complements our classroom-based curriculum, but also provides students with the exposure and experience needed to excel professionally in the field. The department is home to the Poggio Civitate Archaeological Excavations, which offers a summer field school for students interested in taking part in an ongoing excavation while receiving academic credit.¹

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Assoc Professor, 4; Asst Professor U of M, 2; Chrm. Of Department U of M, 1; Clerk IV, 1; Graduate Teaching Associate, 12; Professor U of M, 2; Student Employee, 11; Totaling 33.²

4.2. Currently 88 undergrad majors, 12 MAT.

4.3. 10 Faculty including 1 new hire

4.4. The departmental main office has a desk for administrative assistant and a computer work area for student employees.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Classics occupies 2,239 nsf (2,072 sf in Herter - 7th floor and 167 sf in Hampshire House).

- Herter 540 and 542 - 4 and 5 TA per office
- Herter 544 – MAT library serves as a study, exam room

¹ Information excerpted from the Classics Website.
² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
5.2. Hampshire House (3 TA)

6. **Department Adjacencies**
   
6.1. Interaction with L, L & C and History.

6.2. Davis Reading Room in DuBois Library is a reading and study room for upper level Greek, Latin and Classical Civilization students. The room is sometimes used for projects requiring research materials.

7. **Current Relocations / Renovations**
   
7.1. none planned

8. **Proposed Relocations /Renovations**
   
8.1. Consolidate TA and break area.

9. **Department Space and Technology Needs**
   
9.1. Office for new faculty starting Sept 2009

9.2. Need separate space for Admin – typically Admin shares office with work study

9.3. Need for a flexible break room, staff meeting room.
   - No Herter break room other than extremely small shared floor coffee/mail room.
   - The space could be shared with students, meeting place for Honors Society.
   - Need common space that can serve as a department home and identification.
   - Need space for student interaction and learning.
   - Cart food service in lobby works for stop and go take out, but does not generate student-faculty interaction.

   - 503 is supposed to be a shared conference room but is assigned to LLC and generally not available for Classics use.
   - UMass classroom is poorly placed next to offices and tends to generate acoustic interference (both ways)

9.5. Grad students (TA) are cramped, spend a lot of time at their desks.


9.7. Practicum student/teachers that are in the school systems (student teaching in local and private schools; 6 grad students/ year) do not teach at UMass Amherst during this time. Works but they should be part of the department suite.

10. **Department and /or Faculty Initiatives**
   
10.1. History courses by Carlene Barton are popular with classics students (though not an initiative).

10.2. Travel abroad, summer dig, summer travel
   - Classics sponsors (1) excavation field school program every summer at Poggio Civitate, in Murlo, Italy.
   - When the newest faculty member joins the department in fall of 2009, excavation opportunities at Pompeii, Italy will be added.
   - The department encourages their students to participate in study abroad programs of all varieties and the department periodically offers 2 week mini-courses in Rome and Athens for its majors and minors.
10.3. Center for Etruscan Studies, sponsors online journal called ‘Rasenna’.

10.4. (3) online databases: (1) Etruscan Texts Project- database of Etruscan inscriptions; (2) Poggio Civitate Archive- database of artifacts recovered from excavation at the department’s excavation, Poggio Civitate, in Murlo, Italy; and (3) database of Greek red and black figure vases, numbering over 10,000. Databases are used for scholarly and instructional purposes.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. Majors choose from a wide variety of courses: in addition to offering all levels of ancient Greek and Latin, we provide dozens of courses in Classical Civilization in translation, such as Greek Mythology, Greek Drama, Greek and Roman Culture, Magic in Antiquity, Epic Poetry, Greek Religion, Women in Antiquity, World of the Etruscans, and Greek and Roman Painting, to name only a few.

11.2. Greek & Roman civilization courses are heavily enrolled with freshman 50% of population.

11.3. General Ed courses are also offered (Greek M, Roman Arch, Civilization, (75 to 150 students). Hold Greek Civ just for freshman.

11.4. Faculty tends to teach a 2 course 3 course year.
   - The ‘normal’ course load per academic for faculty is an alternating 2-2, 2-3 course load depending on one is teaching a large lecture course.

11.5. Class size are increasing, now need 75 to 125 seat lecture halls.

11.6. Languages should have specialized classrooms with up to date video and audio.

11.7. Large auditoria are losing their black/white boards which they need for language. Overhead projector camera projector technology may help.

11.8. Single point presentation technology in medium (Herter, Upper level Latin in New Africa House


11.10. Classroom assignment tend to go out as TBD with space assigned after add drop. A lot of research paper work which puts their classroom needs low in the pecking order

11.11. Using faculty offices extensively for seminar space and small sessions with students


11.13. Herter 208 seminar room behind added mail room (12 students). Not appropriate for classroom but it gets used regularly.

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.
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BURT HILL
/s/
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MEETING MINUTES

From: Carol Harris

December 8, 2009

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts
Classics

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/7/09
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:
Classics- Rex Wallace
Classics- Marios Philippides
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments:
A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
   1.1. Revisions were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition:
       2.1.1. Class size is currently governed by available space.
           2.1.1.1. The classrooms assigned are larger than the department would like, but make do.
           2.1.1.2. The department keeps the same schedule and course offering every year to avoid losing the room.
       2.1.2. Graduate student employees are separated from the rest of the department by being located in Hampshire House. This is problematic for the department.

   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
2.2.1. New faculty.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

3.1. There is an expressed need for more access to a “Mahar” auditorium space (250 seat, mid size auditorium). Also there is need for classroom sizes 50-125 seats. Herter has (2) 120 seat auditoria but that is small for language classes.

3.2. Expressed need for a computer room.

3.3. Computer services are currently in private offices; IT space is needed.

3.4. There are (2) archeologists that have collections and need storage. An office size room would be adequate.

3.5. The Honor’s Society (8-10 students) has no place to meet and use the Herter Foyer.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL
/s/
Joel E. Nordberg/CJH
December 8, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts
     English

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
1 Revised 3/12/09 Information Gathering ST02 South College

Meeting Purpose:

English: Meeting, Space Use

Attendees:

UMass English: Joesph Bartolomeo, Chair
UMass HFA: Ron Michaud, Caroline
UMass F&CP: Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM: Ann Storer
Burt Hill: Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg –

1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
       • Existing and proposed population.
       • Findings from building tours.
       • Department location plans.
       • Current and potential department relocations and renovations
       • Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
       2.3. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.4. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.5. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. As a Department, we aim to excel in teaching, writing, and study of the rich literature in English written in the United States and across the globe. English majors can expect to develop an understanding of a wide range of literature, sensitivity to the nuances of language, sharp analytic skills, and excellent skills as writers, speakers, and listeners.

To accomplish these ends, we offer small classes conducive to substantive discussion, frequent writing, and face-to-face contact with faculty. We have a distinguished tradition of excellent teaching with numbers of winners of the University Distinguished Teaching Award and the College of Fine Arts Outstanding Teacher Award.

Faculty are equally distinguished for their research and writing. We count amongst our numbers winners of the National Book Award, the Pulitzer Prize, the PEN/Faulkner Award for Fiction, and the Chancellor’s Medal for Distinguished Service as well as prestigious fellowships such as the Guggenheim, Woodrow Wilson, and ACLS. Our MFA program is among the most eminent in the country. We also have a strong MA/PhD program, with excellent placement records for our graduates. Our Undergraduate Writing Program and Western Massachusetts Writing Program are nationally recognized as well.

The department cultivates communities through receptions (for new majors, for students writing honors theses, for graduating seniors) and by sponsoring a variety of events (lectures, poetry and fiction readings, colloquia). Such communities are also fostered by student organizations, such as the English Society, which organizes literature-related trips, poetry readings, and writing groups, and publishes the literary magazine Jabberwocky.  

3.2. Writing Program is funded by Provost and Director English faculty, Instructors English grad students.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Program Coord III, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 7; Asst Professor U of M, 15; Chairman of Department A, 1; Chrm. Of Department U of M, 1; Clerical Assistant, 1; Clerk III, 2; Clerk IV, 4; Departmental Assistant, 1; Graduate Fellowships, 1; Graduate Project Assistant, 1; Graduate Research Assistant, 4; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 8; Graduate Teaching Associate, 16; Lecturer U of M, 6; Professor A U of M, 1; Professor U of M, 18; Senior Lecturer II, 1; Student Employee, 7; Visiting Professor, 1; Totaling 97. 

4.2. 43 tenured faculty

• New faculty member next year (Laura Furlan)

4.3. Approximately 750 majors, some 140 MA/Ph.D. and 80 MFA candidates.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. English occupies 11,810 NSF all in Bartlett Hall.

• 1– Chair, main office, bookkeeper, copier, new break are in building lobby
• 2 – faculty offices north wing, PWTC, Kaplan Seminar Room
• 3 – seminar room (316A), 4 offices in north wing (376, 378, 389, 391)

1 Information excerpted from the English Website.
2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
• 4 – faculty offices and specialty spaces

5.2. The English department is the main occupant of Bartlett occupying the entire wings of the 1st, 2nd, partial 3rd, and 4th floors.

5.3. 164 - ISHA Clingman + a grad student

5.4. 170 – fire exit through bookkeeper, potential code issues.

5.5. 210A&B - PWTC (Professional Writing and Technical Communications (run by 2 faculty members. (20 – 30 students per year)

5.6. 256 - Kaplan Seminar Room used for graduate seminar

5.7. 262 - Undergraduate Meeting or Writing Program?

5.8. 265 - files for program.

5.9. 316A – recently renovated department seminar room, reception, department gatherings.

5.10. 378 - Oxford Summer seminar, a 30 year old program. Will move to History (double office)

5.11. The 4th floor houses MFA Juniper Initiative - creative writing, poetry and fiction, summer writing program


5.13. 452 – graduate program office

5.14. 470 – currently 3 Emeritus

5.15. 474 - graduate lounge

5.16. 481 - Journal Jubilat, grad student run journal (double office)

5.17. 489 - has a serious roof leak, cracked plaster and is vacant. Repairs have been made; UMass maintenance is involved.

5.18. 491 - somewhat better but sub-par.


5.20. Chair’s office rotates and chairs tend to keep their private office when serving as the Department Chair.

5.21. The 4th floor is completely in-accessible, steps up from the 3rd floor.

6. Department Adjacencies

6.1. Strong relationship with the writing Program, located nearby on the 3rd floor.

6.2. Faculty should be proximate to student classrooms (most English is taught in Bartlett).

6.3. Collaborations tend to be driven by individuals.

7. Current Relocations / Renovations

7.1. None discussed.

8. Proposed Relocations / Renovations

8.1. Oxford Summer program may be moving.

8.2. Renovate PWTC space.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. Computers are used extensively.

9.2. PWTC -
9.3. Would like to make renovations in the PWTC space, remove temporary partition and convert to larger and better space. PWTC, the technical writing lab rooms 210A&B, has challenge fundraising to upgrade the room. Needs an estimated $10K in technology and $10K furnishings estimating.

9.4. Space is crowded. Difficult to have a private office for each faculty member.

9.5. Have fewer faculty but a lot more TAs. TAs serve 20 – 30 students per year.

9.6. Repair or exchange office space that is leaking with cracked plaster (489 unusable, 491 Andrea, 470 Emeritus).

9.7. Student Gathering spaces – circle back to Joe / photo 1st floor cubicle -

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. Not discussed.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. 20 person writing seminars, 35 person classes, large lecture courses 120 to 300 person. They use Bartlett lecture hall but also go elsewhere.

11.2. Classroom space - large lecture classes are now offered driven by faculty resources

11.3. The Bartlett lecture hall (UMass owned), bad shape, flooding missing table tops

11.4. Definitions:
   - small 20 students for writing, often have to go outside Bartlett
   - Lecture and discussion – 35
   - Large lecture – 120- 300, Bartlett Auditorium

11.5. New faculty in last few years teaching many more courses, classroom space is a real problem.

11.6. Biggest challenge is securing large lecture classrooms. Need for technology equipped classrooms with production and AV Box.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. Not discussed.

13. New Facilities Observations / Initiatives

   - With strong ties to the writing program Bartlett is a good home for English.
   - Consideration should be given to first floor administrative area and how best to utilize vacant admin work areas.
   - Consolidation: capture Art History and WOST on 3 to provide:
     13.1.1. Co-location with 316A seminar room
     13.1.2. Appropriate space to relocate English office and reception from the 1st floor
     13.1.3. Reduce TA crowding
   - Lobby improvements required to promote student gathering space.
   - Building improvements critical to stop and reverse deteriorating building conditions and improve quality of interior spaces.

13.2. Option: Removal of Bartlett wing
• Potential to remove the Bartlett wing through relocation of Journalism, WOST, Art History, Advising and a certain number (TBD) of UMass classrooms.

• This option should be explored since Journalism, WOST, Art History, and Advising are likely candidates to relocate and new classrooms are being created in the NACB. Questions is will this remove too many small –mid size classrooms from inventory.

13.3. English relocates to new building

• Benefits would be to remove Bartlett from inventory and consider another new building on site 10 years out.

• Total NSF of departments in building: 38,000.

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.
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MEETING MINUTES

From: Carol Harris

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2  Meeting Date: 5/04/09 9:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: ST02

Meeting Purpose: Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:

English, Chair- Joseph Bartolomeo
CHFA, Assistant Dean - Ron Michaud
UMass, F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions Meeting Minutes #1:
   1.1. Revisions were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
   3.1. Department growth is an institutional question. No new hires have been approved.

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:
5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL
/s/
Joel E. Nordberg, CJH
December 9, 2009
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From: Joel E. Nordberg
Revised December 9, 2009 April 25, 2009

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts
History

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
1 Revised 3/13/09 Information Gathering ST02 South College

Meeting Purpose:
History, Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:
History - Audrey Altstadt – Chair
Ann Storer, Ludmilla
CHFA – Ron Michaud - Associate Dean
Pavlova, Alex Wing,
UMass F&CP - Ludmilla Pavlova
Michael Reagan
DCAM - Ann Storer
Burt Hill - Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose
1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
   1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
   1.3.3. Department location plans.
   1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Undergraduate Program: The history department prides itself on its devotion to undergraduate teaching. History majors work closely with nationally recognized scholars to explore the past in all its aspects, while developing the ability to think critically and write and speak eloquently.

Each semester, the department offers a wide range of undergraduate courses. The requirements for the B.A. are flexible; department advisors can help students plan an effective curriculum. In addition, Commonwealth College students can follow a Departmental Honors track, culminating in researching and writing an Honors Thesis in history. ¹

3.2. Graduate Program: M.A. and Ph.D. programs are available in a variety of fields, especially in the history of the United States, Latin America, and Europe; among these is the nationally known and highly respected program in Public History. We offer a variety of historiography courses in U.S., European, Latin American, and World History. Featured is the Introduction to History seminar taken by all new students during the fall semester. We also schedule a range of topical courses and research seminars. In recent years, these have explored social and cultural history, the history of work and labor, women's and gender history, public history, and the history of science and technology. Recent additions to the faculty have strengthened resources in the history of China, Pacific Empires, women's history, and the history of science. ¹

3.3. The Department has a strong and loyal alumni.

3.4. Strong in US History (above 50% of their courses) including Public History (linked to Art & Architecture, monuments, National Parks, etc.) and Colonial History.

3.5. The department also has strengths in Women and Gender History, Latin America, East Asia, History of Science, etc.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Administrative Analyst II, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 7; Asst Professor U of M, 8; Chairman of Department A, 1; Clerk IV, 2; Graduate Project Assistant, 3; Graduate Research Assistant, 0; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 30; Graduate Teaching Associate, 2; Lecturer A, U of M, 1; Lecturer U of M, 3; Professor U of M, 11; Student Employee, 1; Visiting Professor A, 1; Totaling 71. ²

4.2. 27 Tenured or tenure track faculty, 4 non-tenure track faculty are on one year contracts. They will be adding 1 faculty for a total of 28 in the fall of 2009.

4.3. 3 Administrative staff, including one office Manager (professional) and 2 clerical staff.

4.4. 31 TAs including 1 or 2 research assistants.

4.5. 60 to 65 Graduate Students including TAs.

4.6. Largest Classes are 120 to 180. TA’s oversee 60 students in 3 sections of 20 students each.

¹ Information excerpted from the History Department Website.
² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
4.7. Stress writing and faculty teaching. Grad students work completely under a faculty member and only very rarely are classes taught by TAs. Graduate students who teach their own classes (not merely sections of a large lecture) are TO’s or Teaching Associates.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. The department occupies 9,240 sf, all on the 6th & 7th floor of Herter.

5.2. Seminar room (601) is shared with all departments but scheduled through History. The room hosts department meetings, monthly research presentations, lunch meetings and “brown bags” once a week.

5.3. 612 is the main office of the department and the office for the Graduate Program Assistant. The Grad Program Director (GPD) is a faculty member whose office is in room #614.

5.4. They have a combined copy, fax and file room.

5.5. Mail room has a dilapidated kitchenette with a sink and microwave.

5.6. The UMass/Five College Graduate Program has an African Studies office in their space.

6. Department Adjacencies

6.1. Occasionally there are special projects with other CHFA Departments, i.e.; Women’s Studies, Judaic & Near Eastern Studies, Music and with departments in other colleges, especially Anthropology, LARP, and the public policy program in Political Science; also archives in the DuBois Library.

6.2. The Feinberg Family Distinguished Lecture Series collaborates with Music and Theater as well as the university art galleries.

6.3. Languages. 9 faculty use more than one language in their research.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. There have been discussions about upgrades in computer networking, creation of a lab for ‘New Media in the Public History Program’, an ‘editorial room’ for staff and equipment for the Journal on the History of Childhood and Youth.

8.2. The department is currently conducting a self-study as prep for their external review (AQAD) which takes place in 2009-10.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. The department tends to be low tech but student expectations are pushing more toward smarter rooms.

9.2. Held back somewhat by the need to incorporate technology into lectures.

9.3. Multi media room and facilities. Students have had assignments to create a “Ken Burns” style historical videos and more exposure to this type of presentation is anticipated.

9.4. Lounge space would be heavily used and very helpful.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. Just hired a “new media” specialist.

10.2. The department is making greater use of oral history as a method for research of living people and this is especially linked to women and gender history in the Pioneer Valley. A facility for equipment and data storage, if not actually for interviews, would help this effort.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. Unlike natural sciences where teams of scientists work in labs, historians most often work alone in archives, libraries or on the site of their research. Historians store data and write in their home offices, where they can...
have quiet rather than in Herter Hall with its odd swings of temperature, stale air, ringing phones and large
population of students and colleagues. The department need for technology is in the classroom rather than in
offices or laboratories. The ‘smart’ classrooms now in many buildings fit their needs.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. see 11 above.
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College of Humanities and Fine Arts History

Meeting Number: 2

Meeting Date: 5/12/09 1:00

Project Phase: Information Gathering ST02

Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:

Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:

History, Dept Chair- Audrey Alstadt
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Distribution:

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1.
   1.1. Revisions were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.
   1.2. Need photos. BH will schedule a time to tour department space.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

      2.1.1. The dept. chair, graduate director and undergraduate director all have designated office space as well as keep their faculty office. This situation works well for the department.

      2.1.2. Due to limited space, the department cannot support any more graduate employees.
2.1.2.1. At times there are 3 - 4 stations to an office. The larger offices have 4 stations. TA’s do share desk space at times.

2.1.3 Students use the hallway as the waiting area. The hallways in Herter are large and do not cause congestion in the department.

2.1.4 Department is required by law to save files for 4 years. Student files are kept long after they have completed coursework.

2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.2.1. Tenure track faculty – Spring ‘09 = 27, Fall ‘09 = 28, 2014 = 33. Drop to 27 is from 9 retirements. Want back to 33 but hiring freeze is preventing building to right size.

2.2.2. History dept confirms that there are 560 undergraduates.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

2.3.1. Currently, the department has a conference room @ 890sf that is a good size for their needs. The Right-sizing proposes a 800 sf seminar room and a 540sf conference room. Do need the 890 sf conf room. Would like something for 16 people (maybe about 500sf).

2.3.2. May need a reception area.

2.3.3. Historians don’t use department space the same as other departments. They tend to work alone.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

3.1. Cannot sustain the increasing number of majors. Need to increase faculty to meet the student need.

3.2. Storage space is needed for the Media specialist. Currently equipment is locked in their office.

3.3. Audio/Visual/Recording space is needed for Oral History and film making. Possibly coordinate with the Translation Center and/or LLC. Shared department space would need a formal agreement that creates a dependable schedule that the facilities would be available to each department.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.1.1. History is mostly taught in Herter and Bartlett. Auditorium space is used in Furnald. Seating is very uncomfortable, but steepness makes feel more intimate. Students are alert.

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

5.1. Department space in Herter is considered shabby and needs renovation. Insufficiencies include: leaking roof, water stained walls through several floors, non functioning heating and cooling, and dirty kitchen equipment. Overall it is considered uncomfortable and unpleasant space.

6. Outline next steps:
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New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
1 3/13/09 Information Gathering South College
10:00 ST02

Meeting Purpose:
Judaic & Near Eastern Studies, Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:
Judaic & Near East Studies, James Young – Chair, Ann Storer, Ludmilla
CHFA, Ron Michaud – Associate Dean Pavlova, Alex Wing,
UMass F&CP - Ludmilla Pavlova Michael Reagan
DCAM - Ann Storer
Burt Hill - Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
      1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
      1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
      1.3.3. Department location plans.
      1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
      1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
      2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. The program in Judaic Studies seeks to cultivate an appreciation of the central role played by Jewish culture in the development of human civilization. As an interdisciplinary program, Judaic Studies exposes students to a variety of perspectives on issues of enduring importance and global concern. Students may choose from a wide selection of introductory and advanced courses in Jewish history and thought, a full program in Hebrew language and literature, and Yiddish language. Beyond the core area of instruction, the curriculum also includes courses offered by several distinguished faculty holding joint appointments in Judaic Studies.

3.2. Small Department formed from two programs that started up in the 80s. The department faculty and staff have largely migrated over from other departments and programs.

3.3. Large General Ed courses capped at available classroom size. 120 is the normal max.

3.4. Caps of 45 or 50 on upper grad courses.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Assistant Dean, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 3; Asst Professor U of M, 1; Clerk IV, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 3; Lecturer U of M, 3; Professor U of M, 1; Senior Lecturer II, 1; Totaling 14.

4.2. There is a core of 8 full time faculty including the department chair.

4.3. They also rely on adjunct faculty from a variety of other departments.

4.4. The Department also uses 3 full time equivalent and 2 visiting lecturers for large lecture classes. Two TAs assigned for seminar support classes.

4.5. 1 Administrative staff.

4.6. Of their 1,000 students, approximately half are gen ed enrollments.

4.7. 45 majors.

4.8. 2 more Judaic studies faculty are needed as well as 2 more in Near Eastern Studies.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions


5.2. Room 730 supports 2 visiting lecturers.

5.3. They have a Hebrew (language) lab.

5.4. The offices of faculty members who are on sabbatical absorb their visiting lecturers who rotated through.

5.5. They are currently using a corner office for Slavic language lecturer from LLC.

5.6. They also have a small video library in a shared office.

5.7. Their Hampshire House space is a TA office.

5.8. Judaic and Near Eastern Studies would like to grow and have been requesting new faculty hires for some time. Space would be needed for faculty growth. 4 new positions are desired.

---

1 Information excerpted from Judaic & Near Eastern Studies Website.
2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
6. Department Adjacencies
   6.2. They have cross course listings with English, Comparative Literature, Women’s Studies, Slavic languages, History, Linguistics, Music, Legal Studies, Near East Studies, etc.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations
   7.1. None noted

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
   8.1. None noted.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
   9.1. Media Room/Video library should have its own space.
   9.2. Seminar Room (UMass Classroom) on the floor is good space but shared and in high demand.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives
    10.1. Not discussed. More information is needed.

11. Department Instructional Program
    11.1. The Center for Jewish Studies was established in 1990 to coordinate scholarly research, educational programs and cultural affairs, seeking to generate greater interest in Jewish history, literature and culture. Independently, as well as through its close cooperation with UMass Hillel, the Center serves as an important public forum for scholarly exchange, culture and fellowship. Scroll down for upcoming events. 1

12. Department Research Program
    12.1. Not discussed. More information is needed.

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL
/s/
Joel E. Nordberg
April 25, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Carol Harris

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts
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Meeting Number: 2
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Meeting Location: Information Gathering
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Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:

Judaic- Bolozky, Shmuel
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:

2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

      2.1.1. Use Umass classrooms and seminar space. Largest class size is for 95 students.

   2.2. Population & Personnel List:

      2.2.1. (2) full time ‘everyday’ faculty.

   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

      2.3.1. Emeritus faculty do not have office space.

      2.3.2. Need for classroom/seminar space.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:


   3.2. Need for copy, fax, mail, file storage space and particularly a video library.
3.3. Need conference space for 10 people.
3.4. Need informal gathering space, to encourage the exchange of ideas.
3.5. Need seminar room.
3.6. Need front office and identity space.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
   
   4.1.1. TAs are located in Hampshire House, while the rest of the department is in Herter.

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:
   
   4.2.1. Adjunct faculty includes (2) Near Eastern – Arabic Culture, (2) Judaic – Biblical Studies.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL

/s/
Joel E. Nordberg, CJH
December 9, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg

Revised December 9, 2009

Meeting Number: 1 Revised
Meeting Date: 3/13/09
Meeting Location: South College

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts
Language Literature & Cultures

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Purpose:
Languages, Literature & Culture Space (LLC), Space Use

Attendees:
LLC, Chair - Julie Hayes
HFA, Associate Dean - Ron Michaud
DCAM - Ann Storer
Burt Hill - Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla
Pavlova, Alex Wing,
Michael Reagan

Comments:

1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
       1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
       1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
       1.3.3. Department location plans.
       1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
       1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Our undergraduate and graduate programs in Chinese, Comparative Literature, French, German and Scandinavian Studies, Hispanic Linguistics, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Spanish, and Translation Studies, provide a rich array of courses, including many taught in English, and a stimulating environment for scholarship, collaboration, and learning.\(^1\)

3.2. French & Italian (3rd floor), Spanish & Port, Asian (4th floor), Chinese & Japanese (3rd floor), German & Scandinavian & DEFA (5th floor), Comparative Literature.

3.3. Elementary and intermediate-level language classes (25 to 30 students). Smart rooms are needed with flexible layout capabilities.

3.4. Cathy Portuguese – Herter Annex film studies. The director is part of LLC (Comp Lit) but the department’s faculty comes from an assortment of other departments.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Program Managers & Analysts 3, Assistant Dean 1, Assoc Professor U of M 7, Asst Professor U of M 18, Chrm. Of Department U of M 1, Clerks 8, Graduate Project Assistant 1, Graduate Research Assistant 1, Graduate Teaching Assistants 47, Graduate Teaching Associate 48, Lecturer A U of M 3, Lecturer U of M 21, Professor A U of M 2, Professor U of M 15, Senior Lecturer U of M 4, Student Employees 10, Visiting Associate Professor 1, Visiting Associate Professor A 1; Totaling 192.\(^2\)

4.2. With over sixty faculty members, 370 undergraduate majors, and nearly 200 graduate students, LLC is the largest department at UMass Amherst.\(^1\)

4.3. 8.5 administrative staff (Alice splits a position between Film Studies and Comparative Lit).

4.4. 8 Tenure and 2 non-tenured track positions were identified as needed, but the search has stopped due to the campus wide hiring freeze. There is a particular need for more faculty in Spanish.

4.5. Each Program has a director. Doctoral programs (Comp lit, Spanish & Portuguese Studies, German & Scandinavian Studies) have two administrative staff each.

4.6. The count of non-teaching grad students will impact the lounge/common space and should also be tracked.

4.7. Grad student classes are about 12, Under-graduate language classes vary in size from 10-35, classes that are 20 to 25 are larger than ideal. Advanced undergraduate literature classes and graduate seminars range from 8-20 students.

4.8. LLC teaches approximately 2,500 students per semester (includes: General Ed, elementary-intermediate, major/minor level, graduate level). There is a significant need for additional faculty in the Asian Language & Literature Program (50 Chinese and 150 Japanese majors).

4.9. Many literature and culture courses are taught in their target language.

\(^1\) Information excerpted from LLC Website.

\(^2\) Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records
4.10. General Education courses are generally (large lecture hall classes ranging from 70 – 200. The size of the class is often governed by the available space.

4.11. Comparative Literature courses are taught in English. The size of the class is often dictated by available rooms.

4.12. The New England compact agreement brings in a lot of out of state students for Japanese which is not widely offered in New England. Spanish has declined somewhat but is still the largest single language program.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. LLC occupies 16,471 sf: 14,515sf in Herter Hall, 3rd, 4th, 5th & 7th floors; and 1,932 sf in Hampshire House (TA offices).

5.2. An office (Herter 327) has been subdivided and a window covered with IT wiring.

5.3. Not clear if film studies and Study of African American Language is included in LLC square footage. Thought to be in Dean’s Office total.

5.4. Confirmation is needed as to how DEFA space on the 5th floor should be categorized (Department or Dean’s office space).

5.5. TAs were moved to Hampshire House but should be in central, Herter 5.6. Classrooms would ideally be located in Herter but they are currently spread all over.

6. Department Adjacencies

6.1. More discussion is needed.

7. Special Technology and Support Functions Currently in Use

7.1. None noted.

8. Current Relocations / Renovations

8.1. None noted.

9. Proposed Relocations / Renovations

9.1. The UMass Classroom (342) is not heavily used and has a set of abandoned books and shelving. Thought has been given to taking it over for LLC resource center.

10. Department Space Needs

10.1. Getting Grad Students back into group offices Herter for contact with senior faculty.

10.2. Need a shared multi-media lab to replace the old tape based facility. Roughly 15 seats are needed.

10.3. A 25 seat computer lab with a staff person would be ideal.

11. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives

11.1. Italian (Language) Resource Center initiative is being launched in conjunction with the Italian consulate in Boston. New space will be needed and ideally would have a dedicated staff person.

12. Department Instructional Program

12.1. None noted.

13. Department Research Program

13.1. None noted.
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Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:
LLC, Chair- Julie Hayes
CHFA, Assistant Dean- Ron Michaud
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:

2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

      2.1.1. Revisions were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.
      2.1.2. The Herter balconies have been closed.
      2.1.3. There is a multi-media lab for 15 students in the Translation Center.

   2.2. Population & Personnel List:

      2.2.1. Currently are down by 8 professors. The department is replacing 4/yr.

   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

      2.3.1. Each of the (5) programs (Comparative Literature, Asian Languages and Literature, German and Scandinavian Studies, Spanish and Portuguese Studies, French and Italian Studies) needs their own reception area.
      2.3.2. Director’s offices are adjacent to reception area. Directors move when their term ends.
      2.3.3. Since LLC occupies several floors, mail and kitchenette is needed on each floor.
3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
      4.1.1. LLC was created as a merger of several language departments 3 years ago. The department now consists of 5 programs: Comparative Literature, Asian Languages and Literature, German and Scandinavian Studies, Spanish and Portuguese Studies, and French and Italian Studies

   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
1 Revised 3/12/09 Information Gathering South College
10:00 – 11:15 ST02

Meeting Purpose:
Linguistics – Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:

UMass Linguistics: Lisa Selkirk, Chair Ann Storer, Ludmilla
UMass HFA: Ron Michaud, Associate Dean Pavlova, Alex Wing,
UMass F&CP: Ludmilla Pavlova– Michael Reagan
DCAM: Ann Storer
Burt Hill: Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg –

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   • Existing and proposed population.
   • Findings from building tours.
   • Department location plans.
   • Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   • Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.3. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.4. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.
2.5. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. **Department Background information**

3.1. A top ranked research department with a top-ranked Ph.D program and a very active undergraduate major. Main competitors are MIT, UCLA and Stanford. ¹

3.2. Attracting excellent faculty and students. The quality of space is a major concern and impacting ability to attract high caliber faculty.

3.3. Program attracts a large number of out of state students.

3.4. The Linguistics Department is a center for research in the core areas of theoretical linguistics—semantics, phonology and syntax—as well as in areas tightly linked to that core—psycholinguistics, phonetics, acquisition, prosody and morphology. Research at the interfaces of these areas—be it syntax-semantics, phonology-syntax, or phonology-morphology—is also a hallmark of the UMass research profile.

The UMass Linguistics Department has had a particularly strong record in externally funded research, both in theoretical and experimental areas. In most years between two and five graduate students work as research assistants to the faculty on externally funded grants, instead of as teaching assistants. There are five different linguistics laboratories run by faculty. The Center for the Study of African American Language, directed by Lisa Green, also offers research opportunities.

From the outset, the UMass department has had an important experimental component. Language acquisition and adult language processing were early specializations of the department, followed by phonetics and prosody. Experimental investigations which actively probe questions of high theoretical interest are also a hallmark of UMass Linguistics. Graduate students collaborate on experiments with faculty and perform their own for various courses or their own research projects. Undergraduate students are tapped as participants and in higher level courses, learn to design their own experiments as well.

In the close-knit spirit of our department, graduate students and faculty meet regularly in groups to discuss ongoing research in specific areas. These casual meetings sometimes take place in student or faculty homes, and can lead to discussions that last late into the evening.

Graduate students are encouraged to embark early on their own research projects, are given considerable mentorial support, and are encouraged to deliver papers or posters at conferences, with financial support for at least one conference trip a year per student. ²

4. **Department Headcount (Population)**

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Administrative Analyst I, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 4; Asst Professor U of M, 1; Clerk IV, 1; Distinguished Univ Prof, UMA, 1; Graduate Research Assistant, 7; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 13; Graduate Teaching Associate, 6; Head of Department, 1; Lecturer U of M, 1; Professor U of M, 7; Student Employee, 11; Totaling 54. ³

4.2. Plans for additional faculty (experimentalist) on hold due to budget cuts.

4.3. Office assignments were confirmed on floor plan.

4.4. No faculty increase is anticipated for the fall.

5. **Current Location and Space Conditions**

---

¹ Information excerpted from Department information distributed at the meeting.
² Information excerpted from the Linguistics Website.
³ Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
5.1. Linguistics occupies space in South College and Bartlett. Center for the Study of African American Language CSAAL located in Arnold is a part of the College of HFA, and is directly under the Dean’s Office.

5.2. Linguistics has offices and labs in South College and sound attenuated laboratories in the Basement of Bartlett.

5.3. South College
   - Very poor space. Linguistics was in the tower, now closed due to deteriorating conditions.
   - Very tight space. Requirement for accreditation (National Research Council) to have a desk for each grad student which they are able to just make by squeezing desk space.
   - Not accessible and access extremely compromised.
   - Difficult to bring public or especially student tours through their space.
   - North end of South College 4 offices around central common/library space is too tight.
   - 316 Center for Language Acquisition – upgrade and expand.
   - 105 – Lyn Frazier’s lab – not appropriate.

5.4. Research labs in Bartlett basement. Phonetics and Phonological Acquisition Laboratories.
   - Need to expand and update.

5.5. Proximity with writing program not necessary.

6. Department Adjacencies

6.1. A highly interdisciplinary field with close ties to Psychology, Philosophy, and Computer Science in addition to language related departments. 1 Communications disorders, language acquisition.

6.2. Linguistics should be close to Psychology, their closet collaborator and source of substantial and continued joint funding on NSF and NIH supported research grants.

6.3. Faculty collaboration Lynn Fraser (Linguistics) and Chuck Clifton (Psychology), formerly also Keith Rayner (Psychology) uses psychology labs in Tobin (borrowed not shared).

6.4. Communication disorders and language dialect study (Afro American English)

6.5. The Center for the Study of African American Language, currently in Arnold House, should be located adjacent to Linguistics, its “mother department.”

7. Special technology and Support Functions

7.1. Professor Lyn Frazier needs appropriate lab space. Noise issue in present space (South College 105) and general quality of space is inappropriate for running subjects in psycholinguistic experiments.

7.2. Phonetics and phonology research use sound proof and sound attenuated spaces in rooms 6-8 in the Basement of Bartlett.

7.3. Similar needs for sound attenuated space with other departments. All of the previous language acquisition research with children has been carried out offsite. Facilities in the Linguistics Department are not appropriate for onsite work with children.

7.4. Language Acquisition Lab
   - The researchers in the Language Acquisition Lab are interested in the growth of children’s language. Over the years, we have involved over 1000 children in our studies. We conduct our research in a play like atmosphere with games, stories, and good cheer. Kids enjoy the individual attention and novelty of our language activities.
   - The Language Acquisition Lab has produced a wide range of studies on children’s language development including at least 15 dissertations. Our researchers have collaborated with other departments to develop a diagnostic test for language disorders that has been tested on over
1400 children across the United States. Some of our work has been highlighted in a national PBS special on language.²

7.5. The Prosody Lab

- The Prosody Lab, located in South College, is designed to help graduate and undergraduate students, visitors and faculty in research on intonation. It houses a Macintosh computer work station with various programs for speech analysis as well as statistical packages, and the relevant peripherals. It also houses various sorts of recording equipment used for intonation research, databases of recordings that have been collected either from experimental work carried out at UMass or from externally available sources, and a substantial a collection of books and papers on prosody and its interfaces with syntax, semantics and phonetics.

- In this day and age, when a laptop alone can hold serve as a prosody work station, the function of the lab is to supplement the resources that individuals may already have to carry out intonation research, to provide a meeting place for consultation on research issues, and a central location for documentation.

- A separate soundproof recording studio is available in the Phonology/Phonetics Laboratory of the Linguistics Department in Bartlett Hall.²

7.6. The Psycholinguistics Processing Lab run by Professor Lyn Frazier

- The researchers in the language processing lab (currently located in South College 105) investigate adult processing of language, including intonation, structure and meaning. The lab houses two computers capable of running self-paced reading studies. The lab is also used for conducting questionnaire studies. It is not an ideal space because it sits next to a room used for (loudly) screening films, and it is adjacent to a parking area with occasional loud noises.

- Adult language comprehension studies funded by joint grants with Psychology (Clifton and Frazier) continue to be conducted largely in the Cognitive Psychology Lab of Professor Clifton in Tobin Hall. Most undergraduate psychology experimental participants are still run in the Tobin labs, along with all studies on the role of prosody and intonation in sentence processing, due in part to the lack of sound-proofing in South College.

7.7. Optimality Lab

- The University of Massachusetts is a major locus of research in Optimality Theory, and the Optimality Lab, under the direction of John McCarthy, supports this activity. The Optimality Laboratory, located in South College, houses an extensive library of published and unpublished works and contains Macintosh and Windows computers for word-processing, data analysis, compiling bibliographies, and similar purposes. Many of the contributions to OT by current and past affiliates of this department can be viewed at the Rutgers Optimality Archive (ROA).

- Graduate students at the University of Massachusetts, Rutgers, and Johns Hopkins conduct an annual workshop on OT called HUMDRUM. OT is an important aspect of the undergraduate and graduate curricula, as in Ling 492, Ling 730, Ling 751. Ellen Woolford co-edits the new book series "Advances in Optimality Theory".²

7.8. The Phonetics and Phonological Acquisition Laboratories

- Located in nearby Bartlett Hall. They support a community of faculty, advanced and beginning graduate students, and undergraduates in a congenial environment. The Phonetics Lab contains two sound-attenuated chambers for recording speech and running perceptual experiments. It is equipped with state-of-the-art workstations, personal computers, other hardware, and software needed to investigate the acoustics and perception of speech experimentally. The Phonological Acquisition lab is equipped with a soundproof booth, audio recording equipment, and two Macintosh computers. Its primary purpose is to support research
on phonological acquisition, by providing the facilities for setting up and running experiments on production and perception, and for searching computerized corpora of child speech. ²

8. Current Relocations / Renovations

8.1. none planned

9. Proposed Relocations / Renovations

9.1. Department has done some internal planning on the type and amount of space they need.

10. Department Space Needs

10.1. Critical need for substantial improvements and expansion of research laboratory facilities in order to carry out the types of research projects that are anticipated and in order to retain their position at the forefront of the field.

10.2. 2006 facilities request for lab space:

- Re-allocate Bartlett 5, 7A-E, 9, 11A-E, 13, 15AB, 17, 19, 21A-E to Linguistics (this is space across the hall from the Linguistics Phonetics Lab (6, 6A-C) and Phonology Acquisition Lab (8, 12).
- The new rooms would be designed to support experimental work and they would be organized into four different sub-complexes to allow individual laboratories to be relocated there maintain their own identities – where are these labs today?
- If a new experimentalist faculty is hired an additional lab will be required. Rooms 21 A-D would be able to accommodate this lab.
- Subject running rooms – 7A, 7E, 9, 11A, 11E, 14, 15A
  - The new spaces would allow Linguistics to run up to 14 subjects at a time in a variety of experiments. This will be required if 6 researchers (Fraizer, Kingston, Pater, Roeper, Selkirk and new experimentalist) are running experiments.
  - Rooms will need to be evaluated for size and appropriate ventilation for sound attenuation equipment.
  - Rooms will also need to be evaluated in terms of acceptable size for working with children.
- Meeting and Instructional Space – 15B (new), 6 (existing)
  - These two rooms would be the center on which all research activity would be carried out. They would be used for meeting of lab groups, instruction of lab personnel in the use of equipment, software, and experimental techniques, and instructions of undergraduates and graduates taking courses that use lab facilities for course assignments.
  - To facilitate work, convert 11D to a kitchen.
- Offices and Work Rooms - 7B, 7C, 7D, 11B, 11C, 17
  - Spaces for faculty, RAs, technical support staff
  - 15B – new space for technician, to be hired with experimentalist
- Increase in RAs working in lab is likely due to new grant work anticipated increasing people working in lab by 3 – 5. Accommodating a potential of 14 technicians would require the additional space in room 21 cluster. ¹

10.3. Central common space needed. Community space for interaction, stimulation between faculty and students, and, identity to the department. Kitchenette facilities have been moved repeatedly. Presently in a closet off of common space in attic.
10.4. South College - use attic common space with dormer and seminar space extensively for informal meetings.

10.5. Space is needed for visiting faculty.

10.6. **Prosody Lab in South College** Room 106, is used by Lisa Selkirk.

10.7. Linguists’ space is fragmented within South College. The layout requires going down, outside and back in again to get from their library to their office space and lab space.

10.8. Room 226 is the arrival space and generates high traffic. This creates good energy but brings noise and a level of distraction to adjacent offices.

10.9. Hold colloquium every other week in Machmer with reception in their space. Atrium in SAB as an example of a better type of space.

10.10. Would like to work with children but cannot accommodate bringing in families (parking & general access).

10.11. Audio and digital projection facilities in rooms of all sizes.

10.12. Flexibility in seating arrangements and blackboard / whiteboard distribution to suit different teaching styles.


10.14. Access to classrooms with computer stations for in-class work on language databases as well as work with programs for doing phonetic analysis, etc.

11. **Department and/or Faculty Initiatives**

11.1. See Section 10.

11.2. Tom Rooper (Linguistics, UMass) and Jill deDeVilliers (Psychology, Smith College) collaborate in research on language acquisition; their research is done with children in daycare settings in the community, since facilities are not available at UMass or Smith.

11.3. Lisa Selkirk was asked for projections of anticipated faculty and space requirements they would bring.

12. **Department Instructional Program**

12.1. Subjects generally are campus students

13. **Department Research Program**

13.1. A history of continuing federal grant support that is unmatched by any other linguistics department in the county in the number of faculty involved in this research and the diversity of areas investigated.

13.2. Subject running rooms – certain degree of isolation required for focus on computer screen. The spaces that are currently used are sub-par.

13.3. Experimental observation of the eyes (tracking)

13.4. More clinical type space needed for observation of, i.e. speech interaction.

13.5. Tom Roper cannot do early childhood work as he could with appropriate on campus facilities for bringing in children.

14. **New Facilities Observations / Initiatives**

14.1. For South College to function for any University program or support group will require a major renovation and upgrade. Serious issues need to be resolved for building access, accessibility, ventilation, and condition. In addition the small floor plate size makes it very difficult to make renovations and if made SC will continue to yield small inefficient spaces.

14.2. Linguistics relocates from South College.
• Linguistics faculty and graduate student offices should be located adjacent to Linguistic research laboratories to promote interaction that facilitates good research and teaching/advising.
• The NACB would allow a direct move from Bartlett and South College and could provide expansion laboratory space most likely at similar cost as renovating Bartlett basement.
• The Bartlett sound attenuated rooms would be desired for reuse by other groups (list).
• As the remaining colleges in the study are evaluated there may be other alternatives.
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1. Corrections and additions Meeting Minutes #1:

   1.1. Corrections to the 12 March meeting minutes were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition:

      2.1.1. All current lab space is sub-par.

      2.1.2. Bartlett 68 is a “subject running room”.

   2.2. Population & Personnel List:

   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
3.1. Linguistics lab space is their greatest need. The department has distinct and unique research and lab space requirements.

3.2. Need for a lab ‘hub’ 20’ x 20’ that would act as a multi-purpose/dept classroom. Refer to Selkirk Text (3/25).

3.3. Need for a Computer Lab. Central Scheduling does not satisfy their needs.

3.4. See attached document provided by Lisa Selkirk, Linguistics.

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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Right-Sizing the UMass Linguistics Department:  
A Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Facilities Plan  
Lisa Selkirk, Head, Linguistics Dept. (selkirk@linguist.umass.edu), 25 March 2009

I. The Big Picture

A. Profile of the UMass Amherst Linguistics Department:

- A top-ranked research department with a top-ranked Ph.D. program and a very active undergraduate major. Our main competitors for Ph.D. students are MIT, UCLA and Stanford.

- A highly interdisciplinary field with close ties to Psychology, Philosophy and Computer Science in addition to language-related departments.

- A history of continuing federal grant support that is unmatched by any other linguistics department in the country in the number of faculty involved in this research and the diversity of areas investigated. Faculty with recent, current and pending federal grant support:
  
  - Lyn Frazier (current NIH grant with Chuck Clifton, emeritus, Psychology)
  - Chris Potts (current NSF grant; current joint MURI grant with Andrew McCallum, Computer Science)
  - Tom Roeper & Peggy Speas (current NSF grant with J. deVilliers, Smith)
  - John McCarthy and Joe Pater (current NSF grant)
  - Rajesh Bhatt (current NSF grant)
  - John Kingston (recent NIH grant(s) and current application)
  - Lisa Selkirk (recent NSF grant and pending application July 2009)
  - Lisa Green (recent NSF grant at UT-Austin)
  - See attached details of UMass Linguistics grants in Appendix I

- Headcount – Current and five year projection
  
  - Current faculty: 14
    - Faculty in 5 years: 15 (new experimentalist position, retirements replaced)
  - Current graduate student body: 41
    - Five year average graduate student body projected: 40
  - Current staff: 2 (admin. S. Vega-Liros; secretary K. Adamczyk; work study)
    - Staff in 5 years: 3 (technical staff person, 2 office staff; work study)

B. Departmental and research space needs

- Research facilities (details in Section II): Pressing need for a totally different research laboratory complex: improvement and enlargement of research laboratory facilities in order to carry out the types of research projects that are ongoing and anticipated, in order to retain our position at the forefront of the field, and to attract the graduate students who will serve as RAs on these grants.
B. Departmental and research space needs (continued)

- **Departmental space (details in Section III)** Continuing need for adequate space for faculty and graduate student offices, conference rooms, and the informal spaces that foster research interaction and creativity.

C. Desiderata for classrooms for Linguistics courses:

- Audio and digital projection facilities in classrooms of all sizes
- Flexibility in seating arrangements and blackboard/whiteboard distribution in classrooms for 25-35 students to suit different teaching styles
- Improved access to lecture halls with capacity of 300 plus.
- More classrooms in the 50-60 student range
- Access to classrooms with computer stations for in-class work on language databases as well as work with programs for doing phonetic analysis and so on. (Addressed in Section II.)

D. Space adjacency issues:

- The Linguistics Department offices and research laboratory space should be close to Psychology, our closest collaborator and source of substantial and continued joint funding on NSF- and NIH-supported research grants. Psychology is located in Tobin Hall.

- The Center for the Study of African American Language (CSAAL) would ideally be located adjacent to the Linguistics Department. The CSAAL originated in the Linguistics Department but is now under CHIA. It is now located across campus in Arnold House, making life difficult for the Director of the CSAAL, Lisa Green, who is a faculty member in the Linguistics Department. Much of the research of the CSAAL involves work in collaboration with faculty and students in Linguistics. Dr. Green reports that the current facilities for the CSAAL are adequate, but that the location is not at all optimal.

- If located within a new building, the Linguistics faculty and graduate student offices would ideally be located on the same floor or adjacent floors as the Linguistics research laboratories, so as to favor the sort of interaction that facilitates good research and teaching/advising.

- If Linguistic offices and labs are not located in the same building, they should at least be in adjacent buildings, so as to facilitate the active interchange of faculty, research assistants and other graduate students that fosters excellence and creativity in research.
Right-Sizing the UMass Linguistics Department:
A Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Facilities Plan
Lisa Selkirk, Head, Linguistics Dept. (selkirk@linguist.umass.edu), 25 March 2009

Section II. Need for Linguistics Laboratory Space

Current Situation

The only near-augable research space in the Linguistics space inventory is Bartlett 6, the Phonetics Laboratory (J. Kingston) and Bartlett 8-10, the Experimental Phonology Laboratory (J. Pater). Our research space in South College is completely inappropriate for these research needs. This includes SC316, the Language Acquisition Center (T. Roeper); SC 313, the Optimality Theory Lab (J. McCarthy); SC 106, the Psycholinguistics Lab (L. Frazier); and SC105 the Prosody Lab (L. Selkirk). All of these research spaces were cobbled together in the last couple of years as we lost the South College Tower space and space in Herter, where different and slightly less adequate space for these labs was located. Below I have sketched out a conception of Linguistics Lab space that would correct these deficiencies.

Possible Solutions

• Solution 1 (preferred): A newly-built integrated Linguistics Laboratory in a classroom/academic building that would also house the labs that are currently in South College and in Bartlett basement. (See Appendix 2 for April 2006 capital request for new facilities from then Dean Lee Edwards. This ideal Linguistics Laboratory would also ideally be located in the same building as the Linguistics Department itself, and the Center for the Study of African American Language (CSAAL) as well.

• Solution 2: Retain Linguistics lab space in Bartlett basement, construct new space for the Linguistics labs that are now in South College, as well as for the Linguistics Department.

• Solution 3: Leave Linguistics Department (but not the Linguistics Labs) in South College. Expand use of Bartlett basement to accommodate space needs for all the Linguistics Laboratories. See Appendix 3 for earlier proposals made by me for use of Bartlett Basement space to Cliff Resnick (March 2006) and Judy Steinkamp (June 2004), each formerly in charge of space allocation at UMass.
The Ideal Linguistics Laboratory Set-Up for Current Needs (=Solution 1 (preferred))

The space described below would ideally all be adjacent and be located at the end of a corridor that would include the Linguistics Department offices at the other end of the corridor or on an adjacent floor in the same building, as well as the CSAAL:

A. The Lab Hub- a central space with research, teaching and brainstorming functions, and connection to office for a tech person and a kitchenette

Design:
- room capacity—30 people
- ten computer work stations—2 rows, face to face
- a digital projection screen/whiteboard and 3’x6’ table in front of it
- connection to adjacent office for technical staff person
- connection to adjacent kitchenette

Functions:
- Formal instructional use—small- to mid-sized group graduate and undergraduate classroom/section instruction in quantitative methods, data-base searches, use of specialized phonetics programs, etc. 9-12 hours a week
- Informal instructional use—graduate and undergraduate students doing courses and/or research projects involving technical computer use like that above can work here and draw on advice from department technical staff person or TA/RA.
- Organized research use—instruction and collaborative work related to ongoing faculty-directed research grant projects, in particular for undergrads without desks
- Informal research use by UMass students and short-term visiting scholars
- Brainstorming: presence of technical staff person, kitchenette, available table/chairs and whiteboard, in addition to accessible computers, guarantees active traffic pattern (in non-classroom hours) that results in fruitful brainstorming exchanges

B. Technical staff person office space—connects with Lab Hub

C. Small experimental subject-running rooms for psycholinguistics, prosody, acquisition experiments.
   1. Three (3) sound-attenuated subject-running rooms for psycholinguistics, prosody and language acquisition experiments
      - allow for audio presentation and recording
      - can accommodate from 2-3 work stations/desks
      - can allow for temporary dividers between desks, where needed
   2. Child language acquisition subject-running space
   3. Eye-tracker subject-running room
      - head-mounted eye-tracker, computer with screen, two desks
   4. Sound proof booth and recording equipment (currently in Bartlett 10)
D. Speech Perception Lab (improvement of Phonetics Lab set-up in Bartlett 6)
   1. Sound proof room able to accommodate at least four listeners
   2. Adjacent room housing computers which are hooked up with experimental units
      in sound-proof listening room; large enough to accommodate 10 students for
      instructional purposes related to experiments

E. Articulatory Phonetics Lab (improvement of Phonetics Lab set-up in Bartlett 6)
   1. Sound-attenuated room housing equipment for research and teaching in
      articulatory phonetics, with space for 10 students

F. Six (6) dedicated grant “headquarters” rooms for current PI needs
   Functions of each headquarters room:
   - Office space for 2-3 grant-associated RAs each
   - Equipment storage and supplies
   - Library and reference materials
   - Experimental materials and preparation
   Current Grants/PIs and Recent/Pending Grants/PIs requiring headquarters:
   1. Psycholinguistics (Frazier)
   2. OT Phonology (McCarty and Pater)
   3. Language Acquisition (Roepker)
   4. Computational Modelling (Potts)
   5. Prosody (Selkirk)
   6. Phonetics (Kingston)

G. Two (2) multi-function research meeting rooms with digital projection facilities, capacity
   10-15 people each.
   - grant meetings
   - experiment subject-running for questionnaire studies
   - experiment preparation
   - briefing of subjects in speech perception experiments (before they enter the sound
     proof listening room)

H. [Laboratory office space for grant PIs if Linguistics Department offices are not in same
   building as Linguistics Laboratories]

I. Future needs for anticipated Experimentalist faculty hiring (within five years)
   1. Additional grant headquarters room for grant-supported research by new PI
   2. Desirable: one additional room for experimental subject-running, specialized
      equipment, etc.

J. Possible interdepartmental uses of and additions to Linguistics Laboratory space
   - Additional grant headquarters rooms could be added to lab plan to accommodate PIs
     from other departments, e.g. Languages, Literatures and Cultures
   - Sharing of other shareable research space is possible, e.g. subject-running rooms.
Square Footage Required for Current Linguistics Laboratory Needs: 3320 sq. ft.

A. The Lab Hub- a central teaching/research space (400 sq. ft.) and adjacent kitchenette (100 sq. ft.)

B. Technical staff person office space (120 sq. ft.)

C. Small experimental subject-running rooms for psycholinguistics, prosody, acquisition experiments
   - Three (3) sound-attenuated subject-running rooms for psycholinguistics, prosody and language acquisition experiments (120 sq. ft. each, totaling 360 sq. ft.)
   - Child language acquisition subject-running space (120 sq. ft.)
   - Eye-tracker subject-running room (120 sq. ft.)
   - Sound proof booth and recording equipment (currently in Bartlett 10) (150 sq. ft.)

D. Speech Perception Lab (improvement of Phonetics Lab set-up in Bartlett 6)
   - Sound proof room able to accommodate at least four listeners (150 sq. ft.)
   - Adjacent room housing computers can accommodate 10 students for instructional purposes related to experiments (175 sq. ft.)

E. Articulatory Phonetics Lab (improvement of Phonetics Lab set-up in Bartlett 6)
   - Sound-attenuated room housing equipment for research and teaching in articulatory phonetics, with space for 10 students (175 sq. ft.)

F. Six (6) dedicated grant “headquarters” rooms for current needs (175 sq. ft. each, totaling 1050 sq. ft.)

G. Two (2) multi-function research meeting rooms with digital projection facilities, capacity 10-15 people each. (200 sq. ft. each, totaling 400 sq. ft.)

Square Footage Required for Future Linguistics Laboratory Needs: 335

Needs for anticipated Experimentalist faculty hiring (within five years)
   - Additional grant headquarters room for grant-supported research by new PI (175 sq. ft.)
   - Desirable: one additional room for experimental subject-running, specialized equipment, etc. (160 sq. ft.)

Total Square Footage Required for Current and Future Needs: 3,655
Section III: Linguistics Department Faculty, Administration and Graduate Student Office Needs

Current Space: its many good features:
The space that Linguistics currently has in South College is closer to ideal than any we have had in the past:

- every faculty member (14 of them) has an office in South College
- every active resident graduate student (37) can be housed in an office with their own desk in South College (some in the South College lab spaces)
- there is flexible-use common "lounge" space that satisfies a number of important needs (socializing, TA consultation with undergrads, meetings of reading groups, receptions for colloquia, semi-formal research meetings with colleagues and students from other institutions like MIT, UConn, Rutgers, the annual Town Meeting of the department as a whole)
- there is a seminar/meeting room which also has flexible uses and satisfies crucial needs for the teaching, research and administrative life of the department--department meetings, ad hoc research group meetings, occasional seminar meetings, small-group invited talks, make-up tests for undergrads...
- there is a departmental library
- the offices for staff (2), undergraduate work study students (2) and administrative space are functional
- there is a kitchenette
- there is intermixing of these spaces so that there is a lot of interaction amongst faculty, graduate students and staff

What is NOT ideal about the Current Space:

- Three faculty are in offices that are substandard in size
- Some of the graduate student offices are extremely crowded
- We have no space for visiting international scholars and graduate students, whose presence enriches the department
- We have no dedicated space for undergraduates
- One emeritus teaching professor (Barbara Partee) is housed in a virtual closet.
- There are no classroom facilities in the same building.
- Space for receptions and presentations is inadequate.
- The department kitchenette needs to be more central.
- The space is not accessible to the handicapped.
Right-Sizing the UMass Linguistics Department:  
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Future Additional Department Space Needs:

If the Linguistics Department stays in South College (with current office space allotment), we will need

- One additional faculty office space for our planned experimentalist faculty hire in the next few years. This need can be met in South College only if one of the South College linguistics labs moves out

If the Linguistics Department is to move into a new building in five years, this need can readily be met, of course.
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg

Revised December 9, 2009 April 25, 2009

Subject/Project Number:

College of Humanities and Fine Arts

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:

1 Revised 3/12/09 Information Gathering
4:00 ST02 South College

Meeting Purpose:

Music & Dance Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:

Music & Dance ,  Chris Thornley, John Jenkins, Jeff Cox – Ann Storer; Ludmilla
CHFA,  Ron Michaud – Associate Dean Pavlova
UMass F&CP,  Ludmilla Pavlova Pavlova, Alex Wing,
DCAM , Ann Storer Michael Reagan
Burt Hill , Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
   1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
   1.3.3. Department location plans.
   1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

   2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Music

3.1.1. The Music major can lead to the Bachelor of Music (B.Mus.) or the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree. The B.Mus. is an intensive, professionally oriented degree, for students planning to pursue a career in music. The B.A. is designed as part of a liberal arts education experience rather than as preparation for a music career. The Minor in Music is also an option.

3.1.2. A jazz performance program which requires junior and senior recitals, plus courses that include jazz history, African-American music, jazz arranging and composition, jazz theory and improvisation, instrument- and voice-related classes, and applied lessons. Students also participate in a broad range of performance styles and ensembles, which is of great use when entering professional careers.


3.2. Dance

3.2.1. The Bachelor of Arts degree offers a liberal arts education and allows students to combine studies in dance with other fields of interest. Students are required to take eight courses in technique, and fourteen courses in dance theory. A Senior Project is required. Courses may be selected from the technique idioms of ballet, modern dance, and jazz. Academic courses include dance history, composition, rhythmic analysis, scientific foundations of dance and dance production.

3.2.2. The Bachelor of Fine Arts degree requires intensive study in dance techniques and theory. Students are required to take sixteen courses in technique and fourteen courses in dance theory. A Senior Project is required. Courses may be selected from the technique idioms of ballet, modern dance, and jazz. Academic courses include dance history, composition, rhythmic analysis, scientific foundations of dance and dance production.

3.3. The undergraduate curriculum requires that students enroll in large ensembles each semester. Because of the essential nature of ensemble enrollment to the curriculum, the department undertook and Enrollment Analysis. This began to shape admissions so that the correct number of complementary instruments/musicians would be added to fill the ensembles. Full implementation of this approach is anticipated to increase the department by approximately 100 more students along with associated teaching faculty.

3.4. Previous departmental programs for community access were suspended due to budget cuts. Now small chamber ensembles and large ensembles are playing in the region as part of an organized, multiple-year recruiting program. Also, a conscientious effort is being made to tap into secondary school programs. The department plans to further expand its efforts to include out-of-state recruiting.

3.5. All University students are eligible for participation in large ensembles by audition. As part of the enrollment analysis, the department intends to expand these opportunities for non-music majors as well as increase its recruiting activities.

3.6. Dancers are in a Bachelors program. UMass is the only New England School with a Dance BFA.

3.7. A portion of the Music program was in the Chapel (marching band, various wind ensembles, theory, faculty offices, classrooms and practice rooms) until it was condemned and other sites (Bartlett, Univ. Apts. (condemned) and Grinnell) had to absorb the displaced programs. Others were absorbed in the FAC by converting practice rooms and rehearsal space to faculty offices.

1 Information excerpted from the Music & Dance Website.
3.8. The interview team was provided with a Memorandum dated November 19, 2008 outlining the Department’s growth potential and implementation ideas. The memo has been inserted below in total. Specific discussion on many of these topics took place at the and are noted in subsequent sections of these minutes.

**Introduction:** After five years’ strategic planning, and measurable progress toward clearly-defined objectives, the Department is poised to pursue national prominence in three targeted curricular areas and to recruit a 33% increase in graduate and undergraduate enrollment. It has become clear that a principal determining factor in achieving these goals will be the extent to which the Department can acquire additional space for large and chamber ensemble rehearsal, classroom teaching, faculty offices, and individual practice rooms. ²

**Explanation:** During the past five years the Department of Music and Dance has undertaken strategic planning in several forms, including the AQUAD, a National Association of Schools of Music Self Study, and an internal three-year Visioning Project. To guide future recruitment and enrollment, the faculty completed a “Music Department Conductors Survey Fall 2007: Desired Music Major/Minor Ensemble Enrollment” analysis (Attachment I referenced but not distributed), and instituted a “Three-year Recruiting Plan” in thirty-four regional school districts (Attachment II referenced but not distributed). During 2007-2008 the Department implemented a pilot recruiting project, the “Arts Recruiting Collaborative,” with the Art Department and Theater Department (Attachment III referenced but not distributed). Supported by this groundwork, the Department is poised to move forward with clearly defined priorities and an organized plan for growth.

The Department has the opportunity to compete nationally in the specialized areas of Jazz and African-American Music Studies, Music Theory, and Music Education distinguished nationally by an urban education centered program of teaching and scholarship. The Department’s proven ability to attract out-of-state student enrollment of both undergraduate (and graduate) students will be a powerful asset (Attachment IV referenced but not distributed). Growth will be guided by an Enrollment Analysis completed during 2007-2008 with the cooperation of all of the large ensemble conductors and applied faculty. This project determined, in real numbers, the enrollment required in each applied music studio to meet personnel needs of current large ensembles. Growth will be facilitated by the three-year recruiting plan in which the Department already is engaged.

The Department’s Enrollment Analysis determined a target total enrollment of 415 students. Thus the Department proposed enrollment growth over five years from 294 (205 undergraduate majors, 41 minors, and 48 graduate majors – NASM HEADS data, fall 2007) to 415 (315 undergraduate majors and minors and 100 graduate students, one-third enrolled in Ph.D. programs).

Two factors currently limit the Department’s capacity to grow: applied studio teaching capacity and space. Increased teaching capacity can be achieved through strategic appointments and replacements, supplemented by teaching assistantships in expanded doctoral programs. Enrollment growth planned will require substantial increase in available space.

As a result of recommendations in the 2007-2008 accreditation review, the Department instituted a completely revised schedule in fall 2008 designed to (1) move University Orchestra rehearsals to daytime, (2) schedule a block of chamber music rehearsal times, and (3) facilitate access by general university students by bringing the schedule into conformance with the university’s Tuesday-Thursday course schedule. From this experience we conclude that the Department’s enrollment growth will be dependent upon availability of additional space as follows:

- One large rehearsal room, comparable in size to FAC room 36
- Three additional classrooms, each large enough to accommodate 60 students, one incorporating storage space for music education instruments and equipment needed for class instruction
- Fourteen faculty offices, to free practice rooms now used for offices. These members of the faculty – 4 music education, 3 music history, 7 theory/composition – could be located outside the FAC because they require neither sound attenuation nor heavy instruments or sound equipment needed also in the FAC.

² Information excerpted from Department information distributed at the meeting.
• Rehearsal space for 23 required chamber ensembles – 5 strings, 6 brass, 6 woodwind, 5 saxophone, 1 vocal), each requiring two hours per week – room comparable in size to the FAC space originally designed for the purpose but converted into three faculty offices.

• Large storage room for secure storage of university-owned instruments in individual lockers. On April 2, 2008 the Department completed an inventory and maintenance evaluation of university-owned instruments, and determined a replacement value of $1,285,000. At present most instruments are housed in faculty offices, making them difficult to track and secure. 2

In addition, the Department’s plans to expand the service role to the general student body would require additional space as follows:

• Five practice rooms for use by 20 non music majors/minors who are enrolled in ensembles, thus entitled to practice space

• Ten practice rooms to respond to some 200 requests per year from general student body (often resulting in complaints from parents) for individual practice space

• At least one rehearsal room designated for use by non-departmental student ensemble rehearsal space 2

Priorities:
First priority is to locate nearby space in which to relocate fourteen academic music faculty from rooms in the FAC which can then be returned to use as practice rooms and/or studios for applied faculty who must have sound attenuation. A corollary would be to move the Department’s administrative offices as well, and convert this space to a chamber music rehearsal room.

Another interim measure would be to locate three additional classrooms which could accommodate both academic classes and small ensemble rehearsals, and in which appropriate sound equipment could be permanently installed.

The greatest need, however, is for an additional large ensemble rehearsal hall. This would allow parallel scheduling of major ensembles while facilitating academic class scheduling. This need seems unlikely to be met until construction of an addition to existing space or a new facility. 2

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Administrative Analyst I, 1; Asc Dir, Minuteman Marching Band, 1; Assistant Director, Admissions, 1; Unspecified , 2; Asst Professor U of M, 3; Chairman of Department A, 1; Clerk III, 2; Clerk IV, 2; Departmental Assistant, 4; Development Officer, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 37; Graduate Teaching Associate, 5; Intern, 16; Lecturer A, U of M, 3; Lecturer U of M, 21; Professor A U of M, 3; Professor U of M, 12; Senior Lecturer II, 1; Senior Lecturer U of M, 8; Student Employee, 35; Typist II, 1; Totaling 160. 3

4.2. 250 major in undergraduates 70 graduate students.

4.3. There are 41 deferrals of qualified music majors currently being turned away because of lack of space.

4.4. Their enrollment includes 42% out of state students.

4.5. See additional head count and growth information in section 3.8 above.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Music and Dance occupies 36,836 nsf (788 sf in Ag Engineering Central, 321 sf in Bartlett, 772 sf in Cold Storage Bldg, 28,350 sf in the Fine Arts Center and 6,605 sf in Totman Phys Ed.)

5.2. Over crowded faculty teaching offices are opened to grad student musicians in off hours.

5.3. Idea of an “Integrated Arts District” has been discussed. Dance (in Totman) is not in the natural district.

---

3 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
6. Department Adjacencies

6.1. The connection between Music and Math/Engineering was touched on.

6.2. They also frequently work with Theater.

6.3. Residential Academic Program links music with History and Anthropology. The FAC provides concerts and master classes. Composers and performers in Music also work with Dance students and faculty. Adjacencies of Theater, Art, Music and Dance had potential to inspire more future collaborations.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. No current plans were discussed.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. The possibility of moving academic music components (theory, offices) out of FAC could free up specialty, sound attenuated intended for practice space. Approximately 14 faculty teaching offices could be relocated.

8.2. Percussion should be moved out of the “Cage” which has no sound isolation, possibly to the practice facility on the Mezzanine level where faculty offices have been located in the sound isolation rooms.

8.3. Backfill space in repurposed science buildings could potentially be fitted out for practice rooms with panelized Wenger practice booths similar to Room 149. This might be an effective way to address the demand for non-music student practice space.

8.4. There is the potential to move the gallery space out of FAC to free up space that could become classroom or other teaching space.

8.5. Consideration might be given to taking a portion of an Isenberg expansion concept. This would be a problem for moving instruments, however.

8.6. Moving the choral room in another space/building could help open up space in the FAC.

8.7. A concept for music space in dorms or a music residence building could be looked at for non-music program students.

8.8. A marching band building currently, under consideration, could free up some space in FAC in the fall semesters. Large instrument (particularly percussion) would have to be duplicated to avoid constant transferring between buildings. The distance between locations under consideration and the FAC would not be conducive to utilization of a marching band building by other music programs.

8.9. Dance could/should move within Totman to get unobstructed floor spaces. Spring floors would be needed in any type of facility. The new Recreation building could factor into this possibility.

8.10. The Wilson study has identified the parking lot north of the Studio Arts Building (lot 62) as a potential Science Building site. Consideration could be given to a mixed use building with dance in the new building. This would reinforce the idea of an Integrated Arts District.

8.11. See also proposed relocation thoughts outlined in section 3.8 above.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs


9.2. Need 80 seat music classroom not necessarily exclusively music but probably could be fully utilized by music. It could be in the new building but would need moderate acoustic isolation.

9.3. There is a need for a large rehearsal room.

9.4. Percussionists practice in “the cage” which causes a lot of interference with the adjacent spaces. They need an appropriate room.

9.5. Dance space in Totman is sub par. Room 13 is interrupted by a grid of columns which are both a visual and profound physical obstruction. Room 204 is the stage to the gym. The permanent facilities do not have wall
bars and removable bars have to be used. Looking at taking over the gym when Recreation Building comes on line.

9.6. See also space needs outlined in section 3.8 above.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. They have moved orchestra rehearsal to daytime hours to avoid conflict with night time performances, exams, etc.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. Hosting the 5 College Collegiums.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. The department’s research program includes both academic “traditional” research and creative activity. The Theory and Music Education programs do have ongoing research. Creative activity is seen in the annual performances by applied faculty and ensemble directors.
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**Music and Dance - Music**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Number:</th>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>Project Phase:</th>
<th>Meeting Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/8/09</td>
<td>Information Gathering ST02</td>
<td>Facilities &amp; Campus Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Purpose:**  
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

**Attendees:**  
Music & Dance – Jeff Cox  
Music & Dance – John Jenkins  
Music & Dance – Chris Thornley  
CHFA, Assistant Dean - Ron Michaud  
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova, Pam Rooney  
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

**Distribution:**  
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

**Comments:** A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. **Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:**  
   1.1. Revisions were conveyed by the Music and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.

2. **Space & Personnel Review:**  
   2.1. **Current Use square footage, location and condition**  
       2.1.1. The department has been very happy with the trailers used as swing space during renovations.
   2.2. **Population & Personnel List:**  
       2.2.1. There is about a 60% acceptance rate in Music, +/- ½ of those accepted come.
       2.2.2. The current amount of space in Music limits the amount candidates the department can admit.
       2.2.3. Music is popular and attracts out-of-state students, this will help the University growth goals.
2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

   3.1. See attached document for Music needs.
   3.2. Need sound attenuated practice space for Resident Student Organization (RSO). Space could be scheduled
during the day.
   3.3. Need to find temporary space for Choral Ensemble that includes space for a piano and risers (Bezanson
does not work well, Room 44 could work but Room 36 is better). This type of space could provide a dual use and
also serve as an exam/testing center.

4. Review Location Considerations:

   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:
       4.2.1. An outreach to high school program existed in Old Chapel until early ’03. The program was curtailed
             for lack of space since the Chapel needs extensive renovations. The program was an extension of Music
             Education and run by graduate students.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they
do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no
corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL
/s/
Joel E. Nordberg, CJH
December 9, 2009
Practice Rooms
Department of Music and Dance
May 20, 2009

The following projected needs for practice rooms are based upon a model facility recently designed and constructed by Central Washington University. The number of music majors currently enrolled in the Music Department of CWU (284) approximates the number currently enrolled in the University of Massachusetts Amherst (294)

PRACTICE ROOMS NEEDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present UMass enrollment</th>
<th>Projected UMass enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enrollment 294 students</td>
<td>enrollment 415 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand piano rooms</strong> (141-156 sq. ft.),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 x 150 = 600</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percussion rooms</strong> (181 sq. ft.),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 x 150 = 750</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percussion ensemble room</strong> (384 sq. ft.),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 385 x 1 = 385</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General purpose rooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (81-86 sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 x 85 = 1700</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (107-124 sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 x 115 = 690</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (1148-156 sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 x 155 = 930</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 rooms</td>
<td>56 rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
1. Besides the grands in the piano practice rooms, CWU has Yamaha uprights in most rooms, the exceptions being 6 small practice rooms, 2 medium, and 2 large practice that are designated for chamber music without keyboard (string quartet, wind quintet, etc.)
2. Things CWU would change:
   a. Equip ALL practice rooms with a coat rack and shelves for instrument cases, books, backpacks, etc. The shelf could be located so that the upright pianos could be tucked in underneath then.
   b. Practice rooms should have better acoustical treatment. Faculty offices are well-insulated acoustically, but practice rooms are not. Classes have to keep their doors shut to avoid sound from practice rooms across the hall.
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Distribution:
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Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the Meeting Minutes #1.
   1.1. The previous Music & Dance department meeting did not include representatives from Dance. A write up of Dance space needs was printed and issued to attendees (see attached).

2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

      2.1.1. Staff and faculty offices are small cubicles in the basement of Totman.

      2.1.2. Musical equipment is currently stored in the office space.

      2.1.3. The Dance offices abut a workout room used by Exercise Science. The ‘clank’ of machines and loud music in the workout room carries through to the office space and is distracting to the working environment.

      2.1.4. The main dance studio has columns in it because it was originally a bowling alley. Just as the columns are obstructions for dance, the ceiling in this room is too low and is limiting for dance use.
2.1.5. Recreational Ballroom Dance uses the dance space.

2.1.6. The Sankofa dance program is an African American dance project.

2.1.7. In January, there is a performance touring program. Dance floor and equipment is portable and is brought on tour.

2.1.8. Room #204 has a sprung floor.

2.1.9. Locker rooms are shared with the exercise program.

2.1.10. Exercise Science has been looking for grants to renovate Totman. An energy producing flooring system has been proposed by Exercise Science for the Dance spaces.

2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.2.1. The program offers a BA and BFA. There are 35-50 majors and about 300 non majors. Performing Arts majors require intense faculty time.

2.2.2. Faculty Count

2.2.2.1. There are 5 full time Dance staff/faculty- (2) tenure, (1) ballet non tenure, (1) guest artist, (1) Musician/lecturer @ ¾ time, and (1) administrative assistant.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. Classroom/seminar space is needed.

2.3.1.1. Classes include Dance History and Choreography (uses video and slides). These classes require a seminar sized room for 10-20 students with a conference table and extra floor space for demonstration.

2.3.1.2. Currently, Dance does not have priority to the classroom in Totman, it is difficult for them to get access to this space.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. See attachment

3.2. Locker rooms with private locker space for students and instructors are needed.

3.3. Performances require dressing areas, showers, mirrors, lights, etc. for the students/performers.

3.4. A box office and small retail area is also needed for performances.

3.5. Studios that are dedicated for dance are needed. Props and equipment set up make it difficult to share space with other departments. (3) studios including a Studio Theater are needed.

3.5.1. Studio Theater: a large dance studio that can change into theatrical performance space that would include seating (risers) for 200-250.

3.5.2. Small studio @ 60'x40'.

3.6. Students need independent studio/rehearsal space for their studies.

3.7. Dedicated (or access to) training space is needed. Ideally, it would be in same building as the rest of the Dance program.

3.8. A computer lab is needed to produce professional quality choreography.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.1.1. Bowker is used for larger performances; it has about 700 seats and is too large for what the department needs. When this stage is used all props, equipment, costumes, etc. need to be transported there.

4.1.2. Hampshire College is also used for UMass performance space.
4.1.3. All of dance, including classrooms and offices, needs to be in one place. Instructors and students have dress requirements that make it difficult to travel between buildings. Studios and seminars also require special equipment and props that are difficult to transport.

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

4.2.1. Dance has a natural connection to other Fine Arts departments such as Music and Theater.

4.2.2. Outside dance productions would like to perform at UMass but cannot because there is no performance space. These productions are going to other local colleges.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

5.1. Dance is able to relocate off campus temporarily if Totman were to be taken off line for renovation.

5.2. The new recreation center is coming on-line this fall. There are no plans to keep the gymnasium in Totman as recreation space. A reconfiguration of Tobin may happen at this time. If Dance were to get the gymnasium, design and construction would need to be done to make it adequate studio space prior to giving up any existing dance space. Kinesiology has expressed a desire for the main dance studio (#13) in the basement.

5.2.1. Design thoughts include converting the gym into large studio theater and a small studio as well as keeping 204. The mezzanine could be used as new office space. The long space in the basement could be a student lounge.

5.3. Benchmark Dance programs: Arizona State, Tempe; Williams College; University of Utah, Mariott Center for Dance; Cal State, Long Beach; Denison; Hampshire College; and the new facilities at Mt. Holyoke College.

5.4. Over the years dance has lost its’ space on campus. At one time Dance was in Hamden Dining Commons in Southwest, Cottage Sea (demolished). The department does not feel like it really has a home.

6. Outline next steps

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.
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Memorandum prepared for facilities meeting
May 28, 2009

Peggy Schwartz
Professor of Dance and Director of the Dance Program
e-mail: Schwartz@dance.umass.edu

STUDIOS AND STUDIO THEATER:

One studio for hard shoes (tap, ballroom) (includes upright piano, sound equip): 40 x 40 (Possibly a bit smaller)

One studio for ballet (includes barres, mirrors, grand piano): 40 x 50

One studio/theater for modern/concert/theater etc.: 100 x 50
(Either stage or audience space elevated for viewing purposes; depending upon model, these can then double as studio and classroom spaces.) Warm up space, green room, lobby entrance, men's and women's dressing rooms and bathrooms.

Curtains for all mirrors so studios can be used with and without mirrors.

Small warm up/prep studio for faculty: 20 x 20

Height for studio theater needs to be minimum of 20 feet to accommodate lighting.

Storage space behind studio theater for risers, chairs and mats for seating.

OFFICE SPACES:

Five offices for faculty; main office space for program administrative assistant and student worker

Video equipment/sound equipment room.

Storage space for props, floors.

Costume shop/room for sewing, constructing, etc.

Lighting/sound booth to control lights for stage; necessary stage lights.

CLASSROOM:

Dedicated classroom with computers and large projector for technical/ video/ production/ design / history / creative work classes.

Dressing rooms for students.
New facility at Mount Holyoke College:
The new stage space is roughly 35’ (wide) X 30’ (deep), legs in, which works well as a dancing/performing space. The full studio theater dimensions are approx. 75’ long X 50’ wide.

Additionally:

We have been talking with Exercise Science about the possibility of developing all of Totman together. They have projects going which involve capturing energy which would then power the building. It's all very exciting. The Exercise Science connection seems like a very exciting direction.
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1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
   1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
   1.3.3. Department location plans.
   1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
   2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background Information

3.1. The Philosophy Department’s mission includes both teaching and research. Teaching is at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Undergraduate teaching includes large general education courses and smaller more advanced courses intended primarily for majors. Graduate teaching is directed towards students in our Ph.D. program. Research is largely done by individual faculty using their own resources. Initiatives include conferences and lectures. Research grants in philosophy are rare.

3.2. Under Graduate Program: Whatever your career aspirations, the study of philosophy can help in strengthening your preparation, through developing your capacities to think and reason well, to deal critically and analytically with the ideas, the concepts, the problems, and the methodologies central to your chosen profession. Yet the study of philosophy equips you not just with skills for a trade or profession; it equips you with an important skill for living. No matter where you go or what you do, you will always live day by day with yourself. One of the things philosophy does is to prepare you for this most important activity of living for and with yourself. This does not mean that it teaches you a selfish activity; rather that it helps to instill self-understanding. Philosophy helps you to learn by doing, by actively doing analysis, questioning, reflecting, and understanding.

The range of topics is broad, encompassing issues of values, knowledge, reality, religion, science, language, society, and more. The core fields in philosophy are logic, ethics, metaphysics, and the theory of knowledge. There are also many specialized fields, such as the philosophy of science, the philosophy of art, the philosophy of religion, and the philosophy of language. A student may wish to develop a special competence in one of the specialized fields, or in the philosophy of a given period (for example, in ancient philosophy or the philosophy of the 17th century), or in a particular school or style of philosophy (for example, in existentialism or in analytic philosophy).

3.3. Graduate Program: The Ph.D. program at the UMass focuses on mainstream analytic philosophy. We are notably strong in the core areas of metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, and the philosophy of mind. We also have notable strength in feminist philosophy. Seminars in these areas are offered every year. On a less regular basis, seminars are occasionally offered in other fields such as philosophy of mathematics, philosophy of science and philosophical theology.

3.4. Regarded among the highest nationally ranked programs in the Country. The reputations of the faculty are equally highly regarded.

3.5. Courses are over-subscribed even with 275 seat auditoria. They could easily go up to 400 seat room if rooms were available.

3.6. Strengthening and expansion of the PHD program would also increase strength of undergraduate programs.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Asst Professor U of M, 3; Clerk III, 1; Clerk IV, 1; Distinguished Univ Prof, UMA, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 10; Graduate Teaching Associate, 9; Head of Department, 1; Lecturer A, U of M, 2; Lecturer U of M, 1; Professor U of M, 5; Student Employee, 2; Visiting Associate Professor A, 1; Totaling 40.

4.2. We have 13 tenure-track faculty and, currently, 3 part-time lecturers. We have 23 graduate students TA’s/TO’s/graders. We have two staff members: Beth Grybko is our full-time department administrator/office and business manager; Violet Walker is part-time administrator of our undergraduate program.

---

1 Information excerpted from Department information distributed at the meeting.
2 Information excerpted from Philosophy’s Website
3 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
4.3. 20 Grad Student instructors are housed 3 to an office. Only teaching grad students get offices.

4.4. Non-teaching Grad Student have use of the Lounge (Rm 370) Copy machine, computer.

4.5. 13 FTF plus 3 visiting adjuncts and lecturers. Two visiting adjunct faculty are doubled up in Rm 365 Maya and Michael. Probably will drop to 1 visiting faculty next year.

4.6. Department was in the process of searching for adding 2 FTF to get to 16 when hiring freeze was announced.

4.7. Lopsided balance between courses taught by grad students with those taught by full time faculty. Approximately 1/3 of the courses including lecture sessions are taught by grad students. Faculty primarily teaches large lectures.

4.8. 80 to 100 Under Grad majors.

4.9. 40 Grad Students.

4.10. There are in the range of 2,000 of students enrolled in philosophy course work including general education students.

4.11. Grad Students do 90 student sections (3 of 30 students each).

4.12. Teaching Associates (TOs) are distinguished from TAs who do not teach their own courses. Typically 50 seat maximum courses. A TO needs 2 years minimum experience as a TA to teach.

4.13. Honors College courses are capped at 20 and are usually taught by faculty.

4.14. Also teaching resident courses with TOs.

4.15. It was thought that 8:00 AM large GeEd courses would not be fully enrolled.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Philosophy occupies 3,895 nsf, all in Bartlett Hall.

5.2. There is a seminar room which can be used for speaker receptions.

5.3. Main office space serves as common gathering space also with microwave and water cooler.

6. Department Adjacencies

6.1. Linguistics interchange.

6.2. General cognitive sciences (physics), Psychology.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. None noted.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. An insufficient amount of office space for our graduate students instructors is the largest problem with the space allocated to philosophy. The lack of large auditoria in the university is the biggest problem with respect to our teaching mission.¹

9.2. Our plan to expand our tenure-track faculty from 13 to 16 is on hold due to the budget crisis. But if and when we do receive new faculty positions, we will need additional office space to accommodate them. We have a Philosophy seminar room and a room used as a Graduate Student Lounge (for graduate students who do not have offices). These spaces are essential to the smooth functioning of the department.¹

9.3. Space needed to grow the program is generally basic office space (not high cost).

9.4. Need more mid size (50 seat) classroom spaces. Requests go in for 50 space classes but come back unscheduled.
9.5. Technology needs were not discussed. More information is needed.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. Need to grow senior level faculty positions to critical mass to cover the right complement of specialties. Department should outline what specialties they would augment. Mentioned were Meta Physics, Philosophy of Language and History of Philosophy.

10.2. Growth is limited more by inability to hire faculty than available space.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. Not discussed. More information is needed.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. Research in philosophy requires only an office, a computer, and access to texts. ¹
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Department Follow-up and Right Sizing
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Philosophy- Phillip Bricker
Umass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:

2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

2.1.1. No space for new hires- office space needed.

2.1.2. Current offices are small- need larger faculty offices.

2.2. Population & Personnel List:

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

3.1. Need at least 3 graduate student offices.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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Attendees:
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CHFA, Ron Michaud – Associate Dean
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova
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1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
   1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
   1.3.3. Department location plans.
   1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

   2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

   2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.
2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. The Department is strongly grounded in small classes for maximum interaction between students and a world-class faculty at both the graduate and undergraduate level. Professors, on a first-name basis with students, transform lives with their dedication to teaching and commitment to the highest professional standards, in a season that is, in effect, an extension of the classroom. At the heart of it all, our superb student body makes the Department a community brimming with creative energy.

Because of our reputation as one of the outstanding teaching departments at the university and because theater offers a chance for community, for coming together in our often impersonal world, students recognize that the skills and values we teach are more important today than ever. These skills and values — discipline, teamwork, communication, creative expression, collective problem-solving — change lives and define careers, whether students choose to work on stage, film, or TV, or to go on to pursue successful careers in law, broadcasting, management, advertising, arts administration, teaching, and social work.  

3.2. The Department is trying to grow the program and had hoped to hirer a chair to focus on fundraising.

3.3. There is a trend for students to drift into/through the program to help their graduation track. Requirements for credits is lower (42) than Communications (as an example). They see this, particularly with students who have changed majors or experimented in other programs.

3.4. Serving a large number (580) gen-ed students who are not on a theater major track.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Administrative Supervisor, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 3; Asst Professor U of M, 3; Chairman of Department A, 1; Clerk III, 1; Clerk IV, 1; Costume Shop Manager, 1; Departmental Assistant, 1; Design Illustrator, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 11; Graduate Teaching Associate, 4; Lecturer A, U of M, 3; Lecturer U of M, 4; Marketing Specialist, 1; Production Manager, 1; Professor U of M, 2; Sr Electronics Technician, 1; Student Employee, 21; Technical Assistant II,U of M, 1; Technical Assistant III (Educ), 1; Totaling 63.  

4.2. 200 Under grad majors, 17 Graduate students.

4.3. Web site lists current faculty as 12.

4.4. There are currently three faculty members on sabbatical (Harley Erdman, June Gacky, Julie Nelson) freeing up some office space. One member has recently resigned and a temp (Chris Backer) has been hired.

4.5. Theater has four support personnel (3 professional staff and 1 technical staff who is their master electrician).

4.6. One person in their front, administrative office.

4.7. Two technical support staff (Celia – administers the costume room, John – manages the set shop)

4.8. Ted Hogins provides scene shop technical support.

4.9. They often have a visiting faculty person who they sometimes do not have an office for.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Theater occupies 31,233 nsf (28,886 sf in the Fine Arts Center with 2,347 sf of storage in Bartlett).

5.2. Rooms: 11 is the costume design studio with 2 students; and, 2 is the lighting studio with 1 grad student.

5.3. The Rand Theater handles mostly department productions while most outside performances go to the concert hall.

5.4. 252 B – stage managers office is temporarily assigned to the manager of the current production.

5.5. 25A, the Green room is used as a classroom/rehearsal space also.

---

1 Information excerpted from Theater’s Website.
2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
5.6. Rooms 199K - M (lobby/circulation space) are being used for rehearsal space but are difficult to use because of people passing through. More classroom rehearsal space is needed.

5.7. Theater runs 4 to 6 shows per semester.

5.8. Class sizes range from Dramaturgy (the architecture of theater) (16 to 25) to Acting Classes (12 to 16) to Large lecture classes (280 students in intro to theater, a gen-ed class) which is taught in an academic auditoria.

5.9. Room 199L is also an accessibility barrier due to steps in the lobby transition.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. Music – Music students are sometimes used in productions. Somewhat limited, however, by the regime of music’s programs.

6.2. English dramatic literature (Shakespeare and the Renaissance Center).

6.3. The Translation Center.

6.4. Afro-American Studies, somewhat dependent on productions.

6.5. Studio Art has helped in visual scene creation.

6.6. The Renaissance Center (use of their lawn space).

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. They are considering a plan to take out the balcony space of the Rand to create rehearsal space. A reduction from 600 seats to 370 would result.

7.2. The Rand Plan also proposes to expand up and over the Curtain Theater.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. None noted.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. There is a need for a graphic computer training facility.

9.2. There is a need for special space for Emeritus or guest faculty.

9.3. Rehearsal and classroom space is a dire need.

9.4. Space is also needed for Grad Students to work and meet with students.

9.5. Department has to find space through the Registrar to hold performance classes in traditional classroom spaces/buildings. Bartlett has been used but theater class activities conflicts with the set-up of traditional classrooms and generate noise that transmits into adjacent lecture classes.

9.6. Set assembly area is needed to accommodate large drop fly sections for construction and painting.

9.7. The FAC building is generally inaccessible.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. Looking at entrepreneurial training ideas to prepare students to work and earn a living in the community.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. They are seeing the need to train students in autocad type graphics programs as programs overlap into design.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. Not discussed. More information is needed.
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ST02
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Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
Theater- Gilbert McCauley
Umass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
      2.1.1. The Rand is a 600 seat facility - it could be reduced to a 400 seat facility and still meet the department’s need (the balcony area is not a necessity).
      2.1.2. The shop is shared with the 5 colleges.
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:
3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
   3.1. Need paint and assembly space.
4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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Meeting Number: 1 Revised
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2:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: South College

Meeting Purpose:

Women’s Studies, Space Use

Attendees:

UMass WOST: Arlene Avakian, Chair
UMass HFA: Ron Michaud, Associate Dean
UMass F&CP: Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM: Ann Storer
Burt Hill: Michael Reagan, Emily Santilli, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan

1. Purpose
1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
• Existing and proposed population.
• Findings from building tours.
• Department location plans.
• Current and potential department relocations and renovations
• Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
• Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
• Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Women’s Studies, one of the oldest programs in the country, is at the cutting edge of contemporary feminist work. We approach the study of women with an integrative analysis – in which gender is multifaceted, diverse, and embedded in a matrix of power relations including race, class, sexuality, and nationality.

Women's Studies offers an undergraduate major, minor, and a graduate certificate. Majors have focused their studies on the law, women’s health, the arts, the environment, political activism, the media and more. Undergraduate minors come from a wide variety of departments ranging from history and English to journalism and biology. Graduate students from different disciplines broaden and deepen their scholarship through our Certificate Program in Advanced Feminist Studies.

The faculty in the program are noted scholars in the field of women’s studies and in disciplines such as biology, sociology, history, education, anthropology. Their research areas include: Asian American women and work; Transnational Feminist Activism; Caribbean Women; Whiteness Studies; Food Studies, Science and Technology; Race, Gender and Science; Black Feminist Theory, U.S. Women’s History, Women and U.S. Radicalism; African American Women's History; Genetics; Feminist Theory; Philosophy of Science; Sex Work; The South Asian Diaspora, and much more. ¹

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Advisor III, 1; Academic Program Coord III, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 1; Asst Professor U of M, 2; Clerk IV, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 5; Graduate Teaching Associate, 2; Lecturer U of M, 1; Professor A U of M, 1; Senior Lecturer II, 1; Student Employee, 4; Totaling 20. ²

4.2. Faculty

• 4 today, 2 new hires in process
• 1 Faculty (name) works 50% for UMass, 25% for Mt Holyoke, and 25% for Hampshire College.
• Feminist: Sarah Richardson
• Anthropologist: Svati Shah

4.3. The timing for adding new Feminist Science Study faculty positions was unclear.

4.4. 25 Majors

4.5. 20 graduate students in their certificate program

4.6. 5 1/2 TAs.

4.7. 1-1 Emeritus faculty

4.8. Support (Linda Hillenbrand) Office Administrator

4.9. 2 (Karen Lederer, Nancy Pattenson) Professional staff student advisors.

¹ Information excerpted from the Women’s Studies Website.
² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Women’s Studies occupies 1,783 nsf, all in Bartlett Hall.

5.2. WOST is dispersed in six locations in Bartlett. For a small department this is very dysfunctional; hinders department cohesion, student interaction, and most important severely challenges WOST ability to continue to provide a quality program.

5.3. 7C – Emeritus, Ferguson

5.4. 7B – Faculty (Alexandrina Deschamp)

5.5. 71/72 – Faculty (Miliann Kang)

5.6. 75 – casual space, unusable, bad smell, disjointed location

5.7. 261 held for new faculty, now only need 1

5.8. 208 – Main office

5.9. 208A – Chair (Arlene Avakian)

5.10. 208B – Graduate Program Coordinator and Undergrad Advisor

5.11. 208C – TA lounge with computers used for study and as drop by space.

5.12. 210C – storage room

5.13. 231 – Faculty (Banumathi Subramaniam) – room is very cold.

5.14. 261 – Held for New Faculty (Svati)

6. Department Adjacencies

6.1. Good to be near History, Sociology, Anthropology, and Commonwealth College.

6.2. Centrally located on Humanities & SBS side of campus is key for WOST.


6.4. Collaboration with other schools that deal with gender and racial issues (Asian and Latin American studies, Afro American Studies, etc.)

7. Current Relocations / Renovations

7.1. None planned

8. Proposed Relocations / Renovations

8.1. Consolidate department. This is a critical issue that needs to be addressed for the Fall 09 term.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. Department space is fragmented throughout Bartlett. No opportunity for casual interaction. Program evolved piecemeal and assignment of what space is available.

9.2. The 2 professional staff student advisors need private offices. WOST through the nature of the program is about peoples issues. Large part of work involves discussions on issues and conditions that require private spaces.

9.3. Offices in basement are partially below grade and in very poor condition. Descriptions include “cold”, “hot”, “dusty” and “squirrels”. Faculty are isolated.

9.5. Seminar room for 20 – 25, graduate seminars, guest lectures, receptions, etc. Currently have to use Campus Center, often basement rooms.

9.6. Director’s office (208) not appropriately size, increase to standard size office.

9.7. Journalism’s space is a good model for the type of office suite desired.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives
10.1. Faculty have adjuncts in other departments
10.2. Collaboration with Bennett College and with their Afro American Studies.
10.3. Sponsors ongoing lecture series
10.4. Career fair at the Campus Center
10.5. Everywomen’s Center in Wilder

11. Department Instructional Program
11.1. Teaches in Bartlett 25 (300 lecture hall) and Herter 150.
11.2. Feminist Theory & Feminist Methods- graduate courses that use seminar rooms.

12. Department Research Program
12.1. N/A

13. Facilities Observations / Initiatives
13.1. Look to relocate WOST offices in Bartlett basement to upper floors of Bartlett in near team by capturing faculty space vacated through attrition.
13.2. Consolidate WOST in Bartlett
   - Expand Bartlett 2nd floor - relocate English PWTC space (210AB0 and capture adjacent UMass classroom (206) . PWTC needs to be renovated and it is likely in order to renovate this room it would need to be relocated anyway.
13.3. Bartlett is a good location but would consider relocating to another building.
   - WOST is a candidate for the NACB and their space in Bartlett would provide growth for remaining departments.
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Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts
Women’s Studies

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/12/09
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:

Women’s Studies – Arlene Avakian
CHFA- Joanne Dolan
Umass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:
3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:
5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:
6. Outline next steps:
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Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts

Dean’s Office

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/21/09
Meeting Time: 11:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:

Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:

CHFA- Ron Michaud
CHFA- Joanne Dolan
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the 12 March meeting minutes.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

2.1.1. The existing spaces documented do not reflect the current department set up. The Horizon database is in the process of being updated by Facilities Planning. When completed, a more accurate representation of the existing Dean’s space will be included in the report.

2.1.2. Arnold House

2.1.2.1. The HFA Dean’s space noted in the basement of Arnold House is home to the Center for the Study of African American Languages. This center is under the HFA Dean’s office and works closely with the Linguistics department and also with Communication Disorders & Psychology. It is funded through the Provosts’ Office.

2.1.2.1.1. Personnel count: (1) director (Lisa Green in Linguistics) needs designated office and is not included in the personnel list; (1-2) grad students; (2-3) work study students. The graduate students need interview space.
2.1.2.1.2. Linguistic lab-like spaces are needed. A small room for interviews and recording is also needed. These spaces may be shared with another program.

2.1.3. Bartlett Hall

2.1.3.1. 5 College Foreign Language Program is located in rooms 102, 102a, 104, 69, 83. Room 15B is used by Comparative Literature and should be shown as LLC space.

2.1.3.1.1. Since the program is for students of the area’s 5 colleges, it needs better public access such as being near a bus stop.

2.1.3.1.2. Personnel count: (1) director (not shown on personnel sheet); (1) office staff, (1) grad student, (3) student employees.

2.1.3.1.3. The program creates language resources for people to learn languages. Interview rooms are needed.

2.1.3.1.4. Previous research on this program has been conducted. Ludmilla to forward report and needs for the program.

2.1.3.1.5. The program is complimentary to Linguistics and the Translation Center.

2.1.4. Dakin

2.1.4.1. Accessibility issues are reviewed.

2.1.4.2. Renaissance Center.

2.1.4.2.1. The RC has plans to create a ‘Great Hall’. It also would like to promote outside shows and productions. It would like to become a destination for Renaissance events.

2.1.4.2.2. Personnel count: (1) director; (1) assistant director; (1) staff, (5) grad students (research). Office space is needed.

2.1.4.2.3. The RC has a connection to the English department and Theater.

2.1.4.2.4. Daikin is a great fit for the program.

2.1.4.2.5. Since the RC attracts people from the region and has production events, adequate parking is of concern.

2.1.4.2.6. There is a rare book library in the basement. The center believes the condition of the facility for the books is fine; there is no need to move it to specialized archive space.

2.1.5. Herter

2.1.5.1. Film Studies (outlined in an independent report)

2.1.5.2. Translation Center (outlined in an independent report)

2.1.6. South College

2.1.6.1. HFA Dean’s Offices
2.1.6.1.1. The Dean Suite area needs readjustment in its’ adjacencies to other offices. The Dean, 
Associate Deans, Assistant to Dean, Chief Personnel Officer, Chief Financial Planner, Director 
of Development should be in close proximity to each other; staff & business offices could be a 
bit further away.

2.1.6.1.2. A Director of Marketing & Communications will be a new position in the Dean’s Office.

2.1.6.1.3. There is an IT department. Personnel includes: (1) director, (1) grad assistant, (4) work 
study stations (helpdesk).

2.1.6.1.4. Staff includes: (5) classified, (8) professional, (5) grad, (10) students.

2.1.6.1.5. The Personnel Committee conducts searches and personnel functions and needs a 
dedicated space. The private room should be about 300sf and include faculty files, space for 
3 people and a small conference table.

2.1.6.1.6. A medium size conference room @ 12 stations and large conference room @ 20 stations 
are needed.

2.1.6.1.7. The Dean hosts receptions in his office space now. An adjacent large conference room 
with kitchette would be useful.

2.1.6.1.8. Central Storage @ 500sf, including 1 staff, is needed for just the Dean’s Suite.

2.1.6.1.9. IT needs storage @300 sf.

2.1.6.1.10. Dir Development and Assistant to the Dean need storage @ 100sf.

2.1.7. Machmer Hall

2.1.7.1. College of Arts and Sciences Advising Center (CASAC)

2.1.7.1.1. The CASAC serves HFA, SBS, NSM and is run out of provost office.

2.1.7.1.2. Is being decentralized

2.1.7.1.3. Personnel count: (1) director; (1) primary advisor; (2) part time faculty advisors = (4) 
private offices. (1) staff support, (1) records administrator.

2.1.7.1.4. Director of Undergraduate Success to be added – private office required.

2.1.7.1.5. A computer space for 8 stations is needed. Could be located in an expanded reception 
area.

2.1.7.1.6. Reception and waiting space is needed.

2.1.7.1.7. A small conference room for 8-12 stations is needed.

2.1.7.1.8. Ideally the CASAC would be a part of the Dean’s administrative offices for the college and 
be centrally located to the Arts and Sciences.

2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.2.1. Laura Doyle is 2nd Associate Dean in room 202.
2.2.2. 8 classified, 9 professional

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs
   3.1. In general, the smaller offices are too small and feel cramped.
   3.2. Accessible & secure storage space is in great need.
   3.3. A dedicated seminar room is not required.
   3.4. Small meeting/conference rooms are needed.

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation
   5.1. The HFA Dean's Office likes the location of South College. It is in good proximity to its' academic departments.

6. Outline next steps
   6.1. Horizon Database is to be updated by Facilities Planning.
   6.2. Lu to provide previous 5 college study
   6.3. CHFA to update personnel and population count and return to BH.
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From: Carol Harris

December 15, 2009

Subject/Project Number: College of Humanities and Fine Arts

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1
Meeting Date: 7/28/09 9:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
CHFA, Dean- Joel Martin
CHFA, Assoc. Dean- Ron Michaud
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova, Pam Rooney
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. HFA Dean’s Office
   1.1. Need a computer room for teaching, training and testing.
   1.2. CSAAL- Located in Arnold. Research based in Communication Disorders and Psychology.
      1.2.1. Need a conference room.
      1.2.2. Summer student language program.
      1.2.3. Best proximity is to Linguistics.
      1.2.4. Discussions of moving CSAAL to New Africa House/Mills. The underutilized 1st floor and whole 4th floor were considered. The attic features of the 4th floor were problematic. Overall Mills is considered too remote for the program.
      1.2.5. CSAAL is a high profile program for UMass.
   1.3. FCCSWL- Five College Center for the Study of World Languages

1.4. Renaissance Center
   1.4.1. Given Dakin’s remote location from campus, transportation is a challenge.
   1.4.2. Growth potential.

1.5. Film Studies
   1.5.1. A screening room would be in high demand across many departments.
   1.5.2. Could evolve into a “Visual Studies” program.
   1.5.3. Connections with LLC and Italian Cinema.
1.6. Translation Center

2. Art, Architecture & Art History
   2.1. Grad student employees do not need office space in studio based programs.
   2.2. The art computer room (CRAT) is limited by room size, not the program need
   2.3. Art computer labs might be better thought of as shared resources within Art, Arch. and Art History.
   2.4. Foundation Studio Rooms
      2.4.1. 60-80 students in sections of 20-25, in a studio that is 1,050sf.
      2.4.2. Immersion program, team building.
      2.4.3. Foundation rooms should provide a studio space for students to use outside of class times.
   2.5. Art History
      2.5.1. Room 219 was a Art History dept. classroom lost to UMass. There is a need for their own dedicated classroom

3. Classics
   3.1. Well run, solid program. It is stable in its’ current size; it is not likely to reduce in size, yet nor is it to grow.
   3.2. Has strength in Archaeology with digs in Pompeii and Tuscany.
   3.3. The existing offices are small.

4. English
   4.1. Strong UMass writing program and offers a MFA in Creative Writing.
   4.2. Works with the Writing Program.
   4.3. Synergy with the Language, Literatures and Cultures (LLC) department.

5. History
   5.1. Strength in Public History.
   5.2. Interview space is an important need for the department.


7. Linguistics
   7.1. Grant driven use of rooms

8. LLC
   8.1. 5 divisions – need 5 reception spaces.
   8.2. Need for department classrooms. Would like to take over adjacent UMass classrooms.
   8.3. Working with the Translation Center to retrofit the labs for their specific needs.

9. Music
   9.1. Percussion practice space is in desperate need. The existing space was carved out of a hallway and has only one exit.
   9.2. Could use another Bezanson with multi-purpose capability. Could tie it to the Campus Center and promote summer use.

10. Dance
    10.1. Have heard of the agreement with Kinesiology to make some changes to the flooring in Totman, but unclear on status.

11. Philosophy
    11.1. Strong Department.

12. Theater
    12.1. Experimental Theater, Need test reading space.
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From: Joel E. Nordberg

Subject/Project Number: School of Management
Hospitality and Tourism Management

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1
Meeting Date: Information Gathering
Project Phase: ST02
Meeting Location:

Meeting Purpose:
Hospitality & Tourism Management, Space Use

Attendees: Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations.

1.3.5. Department initiatives.

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. As noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Our Mission

The Department of Hospitality & Tourism Management recognizes that its mission is as multifaceted as the interests it represents. To that end, its mission to teach, advance, and support the practice and management of the hospitality and tourism industries reflects and addresses the needs of its multiple constituencies:

- Educate students at the undergraduate and graduate levels, so they can succeed as professionals capable of providing innovative leadership in changing environments.
- Advance the state of knowledge in the industries through original and adaptive research and scholarship.
- Serve the industry through programs on and off campus that are designed to advance and renew the education of those practicing in the field.
- Support the University of Massachusetts by participating in its governing bodies and serve the state public at large.

An overriding principle of the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management is its ability to successfully serve the above constituents and continuously position itself as a leading hospitality and tourism program both nationally and abroad.  

3.2. History

The study in Hotel and Tourism Management at UMass Amherst began in 1938 as a two-year degree program in Food Management through the Stockbridge School of Agriculture. The four-year university degree started in 1957 in the Hotel and Restaurant Administration program, which in 1971 became the Department of Hotel, Restaurant, and Travel Administration (HRTA). In 1975, the graduate program, offering a Master of Science degree, was established. In 2003, the program was renamed the Department of Hospitality & Tourism Management (HTM) and was incorporated into the Isenberg School of Management.

The HTM Program at UMass Amherst is one of the largest and best-known educational programs in hospitality management. It has been consistently listed in the top ten in the world by independent international ranking organizations.

3.3. Objectives

1. To prepare students for life-long careers by providing:
   - an interdisciplinary education in the theory and practice of the management and operation of businesses and agencies in the hospitality and tourism industry;
   - opportunities for scholarly study within the hospitality and tourism industry;
   - an environment that fosters adaptability to change as well as the capacity to challenge existing practices; and
   - opportunities to engage in practical experience and professional development.

2. To foster and maintain a climate which allows faculty to strive toward excellence both as teaching professionals and as scholars.

3. To work with the public and private sectors of the hospitality and tourism industry as well as the international

1 Information excerpted from Hospitality and Tourism Management Website.
community by assisting them in meeting the diverse challenges of the industry through teaching, scholarship, and professional development.  

4. Department Headcount (Population)
4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Adviser II, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 5; Bookkeeper II, 1; Clerk III, 1; Clerk IV, 2; Dietary Worker I, 1; Graduate Research Assistant, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 12; Head of Department, 1; Lecturer U of M, 5; Professor U of M, 5; Senior Lecturer II, 2; Student Employee, 7; Technical Assistant II, U of M, 1; Totaling 45.  

5. Current Location and Space Conditions
5.1. Hospitality and Tourism Management occupies 26,885 nsf (1,314 sf in Chenowith, 15,856 sf in Flint and 9,715 sf in the Lincoln Campus Center).

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)
6.1.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations
7.1.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
8.1.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
9.1.
9.2.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives
10.1.

11. Department Instructional Program
11.1.

12. Department Research Program
12.1.
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MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg

Subject/Project Number: Resource Economics

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1
Meeting Date: 3/23/09
3:50 – 5:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Stockbridge 217

Meeting Purpose:

Resource Economics, Space Use

Attendees:
Resource Economics, Dan Lass – Acting Chair
NRE, Martha Baker, Assistant Dean
NRE, Patti Cromack, Assistant Director
UMass F&CP, Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Undergraduate Program - Resource Economics is an applied field of economics in which quantitative techniques and economic principles are combined to study private and public decision making. Emphasis is on the food system, natural resources, environmental policy, managerial economics, and consumer and family economics. Areas of employment range from management, marketing, and administration to research, education, consulting, and regulatory activities. Although most graduates accept jobs immediately after completing the B.S. degree, the program also provides excellent preparation for graduate school, when supplemented with additional math courses.

Students in all four options take a common core of 11 courses plus the junior year writing course. Departmental core courses have been selected to provide the basic tools of economic theory and quantitative analysis and a perception of how our economic system works. They also provide a base of understanding on which to build an applied economics specialization. Ten additional courses are required for each option. Departmental option requirements enable students to focus course work on particular career specialties. Although most Department graduates accept jobs upon graduation, a substantial number continue their education in graduate school. Students who are considering going to graduate school in any field of economics should supplement Departmental requirements with additional math courses. Consult with your advisor and note section IIC below on additional recommended courses. 1

3.2. Graduate Program - The Department of Resource Economics offers programs of study toward the Master of Science Degree and the Doctor of Philosophy Degree. Major fields of study are (1) Natural Resource and Environmental Economics, (2) Marketing/Industrial Organization of the Food System, and (3) Applied Econometrics. A strong foundation in economic theory and quantitative methods is emphasized for students in all fields.

Graduates of the Master's program in Resource Economics are prepared for careers in marketing, resource-based industries such as electric utilities and petroleum, government environmental policy positions, and economic consulting. Doctoral program graduates typically find employment in research positions in industry, academia, and government. 1

3.3. The Department is moving to the School of Management but might also have been associated with Economics in SBS.

3.4. They tend to think of themselves as social scientists.

3.5. The Department comes out of the Agricultural school program through Agriculture, Food Sources, Natural Resources and the Environment. The program evolved to broader, economic concerns as the college has also evolved.

3.6. They have a strong interdisciplinary minor in “IT” which is also offered across the other colleges.

3.7. Interest in admissions has grown due to planned association with SOM.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Assoc Professor U of M, 3; Asst Professor U of M, 2; Clerk III, 3; Graduate Research Assistant, 5; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 10; Graduate Teaching Associate, 1; Head of Department, 1; Lecturer A, U of M, 2; Lecturer U of M, 2; Post Doctoral Res Assoc U M, 1; Professor A U of M, 1; Professor U of M, 7; Research Fellow UM, 1; Software Consultant Adv Lvl, 1; Student Employee, 3; Technical Specialist II,U of M, 1; Totaling 44. 2

1 Information excerpted from Resource Economics Website.

2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
4.2. Faculty – 13; Professional Staff 1; Adjunct (Retired Faculty) 2 (room 201); Post Doctoral Researcher 1; Lecturers 3; Classified Staff – 4; Graduate Students 17.  

4.3. They should grow by 2.5 faculty in addition to one new hire on the way.  

4.4. One position has been secured under the previous “250-Plan”. That faculty member is scheduled to arrive this summer, perhaps as soon as July.  

4.5. The program has grown from 80 to 240 students in 4 years. They pick-up a number of School of Management students who do not get acceptance into SOM.  

4.6. They are currently without 2.5 faculty members. Two retirements have been unfilled and a half-position shared with Public Policy is also unfilled.  

5. Current Location and Space Conditions  

5.1. Resource Economics occupies 10,957 nsf, (10,157 sf in Stockbridge and 800 sf in Draper). They are happy with the location in general.  

5.2. Current Faculty are generally satisfied with their office space.  

5.3. They have graduate student space in Draper (5 in rm 320 & 3 in rm 319)  

5.4. The Department has one common room under their control, Stockbridge 210. The room is fairly heavily used for research meetings and other departmental meetings.  

5.5. They use Stockbridge 217 for meetings, but scheduling that room is done through the Dean’s office and it is not regularly available.  

5.6. Experimental Economics requires the use of their lab, which was developed 3 years ago. The lab has 36 computers and is a very good space for the experiments that are conducted under grants.  

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)  


6.2. Research is conducted with faculty from Environmental Sciences, Plant and Soil Sciences, School of Management, Economics, Natural Resources Conservation, among others. These relationships are not constrained by space.  

7. Current Relocations or Renovations  

7.1. Space for graduate school research is not good. Many of the students do not use the space because of the condition of the space and the computers. This erodes the quality of the relationships between professors and paid grad students.  

7.2. Renovations of Rooms 201 and 320. The former will expand office space: the latter will improve research space, but further limit graduate student office space.  

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations  

8.1. They would like to renovate and use basement space in Stockbridge if it becomes available.  

9. Department Space and Technology Needs  

9.1. Computers are heavily used and more are needed for research and teaching.  

9.2. Several courses heavily utilize computers in teaching. They currently use the Experimental Economics lab for teaching. While a nice space, it is poorly designed for teaching. The privacy required for experiments is contrary to the visibility needed for effective teaching. A good teaching lab with sufficient numbers of computers to make good use of faculty time in teaching is needed.  

3 Information excerpted from Department information distributed at the meeting.
9.3. While faculty are currently satisfied with their office space, there is little flexibility in terms of office space for new faculty. They also need office space they can offer to lecturers who teach courses. Only on, DonnaSpraggon, has office space within what can be considered the “Departments Space”.  

9.4. Additional space is needed for Post-Doctoral Researchers or Research Associates that might be hired through grants.  

9.5. Space is needed for office hours for TAs in their large undergraduate courses. The space needs to have computers available for TA office hours for many (other) courses from microeconomics through statistics. Statistics alone has office hours 12 hours per week.  

9.6. Space is needed for make-up exams, including quiet space for students who may have learning disabilities.  

9.7. Quality research space for graduate research assistants and post doctoral researchers is needed. Graduates research assistants need space with computer access to conduct their research. Faculty are frustrated with the current space as it encourages graduate RAs to go elsewhere to work. Graduate office space is lacking, poorly designed and in need of renovations to provide quality work space.  

9.8. The IT support team needs space to build up new computers, work on older computers and store computers equipment. They currently use space that is not very secure outside their offices. 

9.9. Renovations for room 320 are needed to provide a staging area for experiments. This is a very real need for faculty research in experimental methods.  

9.10. Renovations to Room 201 will make copier and printer space scarce as well as storage space for office supplies. 

9.11. There is a need for a true conference room (217 is under the Dean’s control). A large conference room would be used for quick research meetings, advising groups of students, and office hours for large lecture courses.  

9.12. There is a need for teaching space for lab sections for courses requiring computer analysis.  

9.13. SASS software is needed for grad students doing economic model research. The software is not available to individuals requiring them to work in the department. 

9.14. A lounge space for faculty and students is needed. 

9.15. A lounge space for undergraduate students would also be used for the Resource Economics Club. 


9.17. They need a 50 station experimental computer teaching lab space. They currently have to split into 3 sections. There doesn’t seem to be a room large enough in Stockbridge for a room of that scale. Could be shared in an adjacent space. Might also double as a testing facility. 


10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives 

10.1. More information is needed. 

11. Department Instructional Program 

11.1. More information is needed. 

12. Department Research Program 

12.1. Typically working with students. 

12.2. Applied Research Empirical and (?) 

12.3. Food safety 

12.4. Applied Micro Economics.
12.5. Looking at how individuals respond to various external economic pressures and conditions.
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From: Carol Harris    December 10, 2009

Subject/Project Number:
Isenberg School of Management
Resource Economics

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number:  Meeting Date:  Project Phase:  Meeting Location:
2  5/13/09  9:00  Information Gathering  Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:    Distribution:
NRE- Patti Cromack    Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg
NRE- Martha Baker
Resource Economics- Dan Lass
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
   1.1. (item 3.4) Resource Economists are social scientists.
   1.2. (item 8.1) Resource Economics would like more student space in Stockbridge. They need space for a new faculty hire.
   1.3. Need regularly scheduled Seminar space, such as 217 (85 person room).

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:
       2.3.1. Could use a dedicated department Chair office and undergraduate advising offices.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
3.1. Reception area is in need.
3.2. Need a statistics tutoring lab w/ 8 stations.
3.3. Need a 50 station computer teaching lab.
3.4. Room for make-up exams (20 stations).

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

   4.2.1. Resource Economics recently was merged into ISOM from the School of Natural Resources and the Environment. The connection with the business school is good for the program and the school.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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Attendees: Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova
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DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. As noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to address the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Mission Statement

The Isenberg School of Management advances the reputation and mission of the University of Massachusetts' flagship campus and land grant institution by 1) Making an impact on research in management, on the teaching of management, and the practice of management by creating and sharing new knowledge, 2) Preparing students for a rapidly changing business environment by providing high quality educational programs, and 3) Supporting organizations within the Commonwealth and other constituencies through outreach activities. In fulfilling this mission, the Isenberg School follows these principles:

1. We are committed to a diversity of backgrounds, interests and perspectives in the people we employ, the students we enroll, and the programs we offer;

2. We provide an exceptional education and develop men and women of high integrity to be leaders in their chosen fields;

3. We value the importance of the interdisciplinary nature of business and create programmatic offerings accordingly;

4. We build core areas of research strength and respond to new and burgeoning areas with our research focus and program development; and

5. We prepare our students for the marketplace through job placement support services and strong connections with alumni and corporate partners. ¹

3.2. Vision and Goals

To advance and embody the University's aspiration to assume its place among the upper echelon of national public universities, the Isenberg School plays a critical role by:

1. Increasing levels of published research and scholarship, and building interdisciplinary research teams;

2. Creating and growing the revenue generating potential of research centers and interdisciplinary research programs;

3. Growing and further developing our graduate programs and expanding their national and international reach;

¹ Information excerpted from the Isenberg School of Management Website.
4. Developing an innovative approach to undergraduate education via regular curricular changes and the optimal preparation of our students to make significant contributions in the marketplace and to society as a whole;

5. Prioritizing faculty position allocations with a focus on areas where we do or can excel and become a national power;

6. Strengthening alumni fundraising efforts to focus on the improvement of our infrastructure and operations, and increasing the participation of our alumni; and

7. Developing a centralized and systematic approach to communicate the Isenberg values, goals, and success stories to both internal and external stakeholders.  

3.3. Sports Management and Hospitality and Tourism Management (HTM) have joined the College since the Alfond addition opened.

3.4. Resource Economics will be joining the SOM and will have to revise its curriculum to meet business school requirements. This will bring new space demands as business school required classes will gain population.

3.5. The University of Indiana is a peer program for UMass.

4. Department Headcount (Population)
4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Adviser II, 3; Academic Advisor/Program Coord, 1; Academic Program Coord III, 1; Accountant I, 1; Administrative Analyst II, 1; Administrative Analyst III, 1; Administrative Secretary I, 1; Assoc Dean, School of Mgmt, 1; Asst Director, Advising Service, 1; Audio Visual Equip Tech I, 1; Clerk III, 1; Clerk IV, 5; Clerk V, 1; Computer Specialist, 1; Dean, School of Management, 1; Departmental Assistant, 2; Ex Dir Career Services ISOM, 1; Finance/Budget Supervisor, 1; Graduate Research Assistant, 61; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 34; Graduate Teaching Associate, 13; Intern, 1; LAN Manager, 1; LAN/WAN Specialist, 1; Lecturer U of M, 7; Marketing Manager, 1; Offset Duplicating Mach Op II, 1; Senior Development Officer, 1; Senior Lecturer II, 1; Senior Lecturer U of M, 2; Sr Advisor, Career Services, 2; Sr Computer Specialist, 2; Sr LAN Administrator/Analyst, 1; Sr LAN Coordinator, 1; Staff Assistant, 1; Staff Writer/Editor, 1; Student Employee, 61; Technical Consultant, 1; Typist II, 1; Totaling 220.  

5. Current Location and Space Conditions
5.1. The Deans office occupies 35,068 nsf (19,826sf in Alfond and 15,242 sf in Isenberg).

5.2. HTM is in Flint where they left out in classrooms and advising. This hurts the integration of the department into the School of Management. The space in Flint is very poor quality, inaccessible space as well. Priority to get classrooms (students) into the business school community.

5.3. The School is at capacity and could not grow without more space.

5.4. Resource Economics brings an additional 200 students that will be taking business school classes in addition to their major’s requirements.

5.5. They use 6:30 PM and 8:00 AM schedule slots in Mahar to get into the large lecture space. Some student get scheduled for multiple evening classes per week limiting extra curricular involvements.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)
6.1. They would like to use Mahar more. They have one statistic class in Mahar but would like to have more large lecture format classes.

6.2. Primary lacking adjacency is with HTM.

6.3. They are under pressures to provide large classes and could use access to larger auditoria.

2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
7. **Current Relocations or Renovations**
   7.1. None noted.

8. **Proposed Relocations or Renovations**
   8.1. The adjacent fraternity houses sites might be an attractive location for future expansion.
   8.2. Open space where another set of fraternity house were razed, north of the existing houses might also be attractive.
   8.3. University Apartments is scheduled to come down this summer but that site across the street.

9. **Department Space and Technology Needs**
   9.1. They are satisfied with the quality of the space which is excellent in many areas. Their primary issue is that more space is needed even if the school does not grow.
   9.2. They would like to bring their space to the standard of Sports Management’s offices.

10. **Department and /or Faculty Initiatives**
    10.1. Their undergraduate, on-line program generates $1 mil+. Even this program needs more space to grow however. The On-Line BBA is currently being run by 1 person with an overseer, marketer and advisor.
    10.2. Campus collaborative initiatives with other departments would be bolstered by institutes to raise funds. No space is available to house and establish more institutes.

11. **Department Instructional Program**
    11.1. Their Minuteman Equity Fund (a student investment trading program) needs a meeting room for with space for a “stock ticker”.
    11.2. There is pressure to grow the MBA program.

12. **Department Research Program**
    12.1. Not discussed.
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December 10, 2009

Subject/Project Number:  
Isenberg School of Management  
ISOM  

New Academic Classroom Facilities  
University of Massachusetts – Amherst  
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1  
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number:  
Meeting Date:  
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ST02  
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Meeting Purpose:

Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:  
Distribution:

ISOM- Carol Barr, Jay Gladden  
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova  
DCAM- Ann Storer  
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg  
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
      2.1.1. Room 104 has a 88 seat class size limit. This is critical for teaching efficiency, otherwise would have to look at multiple sections.
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
      2.2.1. The school will be getting a new Dean soon.
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:
3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
   3.1. HTM needs a computer lab for 50-60 students (scheduled as a class lab and non class lab)
4. Review Location Considerations:
4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:
   4.2.1. Resource Economics is joining ISOM. The department could benefit from the computer facilities at ISOM.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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Meeting Number: 3  Meeting Date: 7/21/09
Meeting Date: 9:00  Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: ISOM, Dean- Tony Butterfield
UMass F&CP- Susan Personnette, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Distribution: Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. ISOM Dean
   1.1. Now 7 departments with the addition of Resource Economics.
   1.2. Dean of Graduate Students and Dean of Undergraduate Students with a Director of the entire school.
   1.3. Advising.

2. Accounting and Information Systems
   2.1. Houses a mailroom that is shared by all departments in the school.
   2.2. There are (2) faculty vacancies.
   2.3. Reception/identity space is Room 359.
   2.4. (1) full time accounting staff plus (1) ½ time Accounting ½ Marketing staff.

3. Finance Operations

4. Management

5. Marketing

6. Resource Economics
   6.1. New to ISOM.
6.2. Likes current space. Experimental Economics Lab.

7. Hotel and Tourism Management
   7.1. Offices in Flint are oversized.
   7.2. Food Service areas are for teaching.
   7.3. Excessive existing storage, but is mostly attic space and mechanical/basement space.

8. Sport Management
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Meeting Purpose:

School of Nursing, Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:

SON, Jean Swinney – Interim Dean
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova
Pavlova, Alex Wing,
DCAM, Ann Storer
Michael Reagan
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.
2.3. As noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. The School of Nursing at the University of Massachusetts Amherst has always been a leader in nursing education. Since its founding in 1953, it has continuously developed academic programs to address society's ongoing and emerging health needs and to prepare graduates for practice in diverse settings.

Faculty with published nursing research, advanced clinical skills, and innovative approaches to teaching challenge and engage students, offering them various modes of learning including self-paced modules.

At the bachelor’s degree level, foundation courses in the arts, sciences and humanities form the basis of the nursing major, which prepares graduates to practice in various health-care settings. The undergraduate program integrates the core knowledge, core competencies, and role development expected for the undergraduate level of nursing education. The master’s programs build on baccalaureate competencies and focus on developing clinical specialty roles. Doctoral programs provide preparation for a research/academic role (PhD) and advanced clinical practice (DNP).

For more than half a century, the School of Nursing has focused on assessing and meeting the needs of individuals, families, and communities as those needs change. The clinical agencies in which the School places its students include hospitals, extended care facilities, ambulatory care clinics, schools, senior centers, day programs, and correctional facilities across Massachusetts and throughout New England. Students also take part in a range of cross-cultural experiences in Africa and in the United Kingdom including Northern Ireland. 

3.2. Vision

The school of Nursing is a force for innovation, learning and discovery in preparing culturally proficient nurses for leadership in health for a global society.

3.3. Mission

To provide an affordable and accessible education to enhance health and healing through nursing leadership in teaching, scholarship, practice and service.

3.4. Values

We, the faculty of the School of Nursing, are committed to:

- Caring and Collaborative Relationships
  - Caring and compassion as the heart of evidence-based nursing practice
  - Collaboration with clients, nursing and interdisciplinary peers as essential to enhancing health and healing
  - Attending to the needs and input of vulnerable and underserved populations

- Leadership
  - Nursing's contribution to reducing health disparities and promoting health in a global society.
  - An environment that enhances the social conscience and professional development of all members of the School of Nursing.
  - The knowledge that environments are interrelated systems that affect and are affected by nursing practice, culture, and public policy.
  - Students developing their identity as agents for innovation in the world.

- Excellence
  - The reciprocal relationships among teaching, scholarship, and engagement.
  - Encouraging integrity and high moral character in all members of the School of Nursing.
  - Becoming reflective practitioners to increase the authenticity of our work (Boyer...).

- Innovation
  - Creative ways of acquiring, managing and sharing knowledge.

---

1 Information excerpted from the School of Nursing’s Website.
• Diversity
  o Striving to design and provide culturally sensitive nursing care in a global society.
  o Promoting diversity in our school and in the profession.
• Life Long Learning
  o Arts, humanities, and sciences as a foundation for nursing education.
  o Learning as a dynamic, collaborative process that promotes mutual growth of students and teachers.  

3.5. Engagement Goals

Establish innovative scholarly engagement models that define and respond to the health of the public. Our goal is to:
• Contribute to the search for answers to the most pressing social, civic, economic and moral problems facing our profession and world today. (Boyer, )
• Facilitate and enhance an organizational culture of diversity that promotes the success of collaborative partnerships, relationships, and affiliations within a global community. .
• Promote and expand faculty practice, which reflects the expertise of faculty needs and needs of our communities of interest.
• Promote faculty development and systematic understanding through a variety of mechanisms that would include:
  o Coordinating access to all existing internal university resources.
  o Securing external global resources.
  o Mentoring faculty with the ongoing development of their academic careers.
• Contribute to systematic and structural improvement of the University and U-Mass systems.
• Promote service to the underserved and vulnerable populations in our region. 1

3.6. Teaching Goals

We prepare professional nurses by creating an innovative environment for inquiry, discovery, and learning with diverse populations. Our goals are to:
• Ensure a flexible learner centered environment that utilizes information technology to its highest potential to ensure collaboration and inclusiveness
• Foster the advancement of students through graduate education
• Ensure a comprehensive, cohesive curriculum which prepares students for leadership in a changing and diverse sociopolitical world. 1

3.7. Scholarship Goals

Enhance the art and science of nursing by creating, translating, and disseminating knowledge. Our goals are to:
• Facilitate the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching
• Foster a creative environment that supports scholarship activities
• Enhance mechanisms for interdisciplinary scholarship.  

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Advisor III, 1; Administrative Analyst I, 1; Administrative Analyst III, 1; Administrative Manager, 1; Administrative Secretary I, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 7; Asst Professor U of M, 2; Clerk III, 5; Clerk IV, 2; Clinical Assistant Professor, 41; Clinical Associate Professor, 1; Clinical Instructor A U of M, 1; Clinical Instructor U of M, 4; Dean, Nursing, 1; Graduate Research Assistant, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 11; Graduate Teaching Associate, 3; Student Employee, 11; Totaling 95. 2

4.2. 69 in Arnold Hall and 26 in Skinner Hall.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
5.1. Nursing occupies a total of 31,247 nsf (8,678 sf in Arnold House, 901 sf in Montague House, 4,012 sf in Morrill II, and 17,656 sf in Skinner Hall).

5.2. Skinner Hall has been newly renovated. All of the department offices are in Skinner.

5.3. Their largest classroom is 65 seats.

5.4. The lighting is very effective and thought by some to be one of the biggest successes of the renovation.

5.5. Classroom desks may not be substantial enough to hold up. There are no left handed desks.

5.6. Their simulation labs are the best in the state.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. Not discussed. More information is needed.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. Not discussed. More information is needed.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. Not discussed. More information is needed.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. To grow, the department classrooms would be needed with higher seating capacities.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. The School has been charged, by the Board of Trustees, (with the 5 colleges) to assess the nursing needs of the Commonwealth to help establish and meet the needs for nursing training throughout the State. Targeting the end of May.

11. Department Instructional Program


12. Department Research Program
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Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the 12 April meeting minutes.
   1.1. None noted

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.1.1. There is no space retained in Arnold, Montague House or Morrill Sci Ctr. School of Nursing has consolidated in its entirety from 3 buildings into Skinner Hall
   2.1.1.1. Nursing gets top priority for classrooms in Skinner.
   2.1.1.2. Classrooms in Skinner are scheduled in 6 hr blocks on 2 consecutive days.
   2.1.1.3. The seminar rooms are assigned to Nursing. The rooms provide stations in multiples of 8.
   2.1.2. Clinical programs take place off campus.
   2.1.3. Public Health is located in Arnold 1st floor.

2.2. Population & Personnel List
2.2.1. Confirm counts

2.2.1.1. 26 fulltime faculty have private offices. Of that number, 10 are tenured, (1) dean, (2) assistant prof., (7) associate prof.

2.2.1.2. 16 full time clinical assistants (equivalent to lecturer) have shared or private office space. Of that number there are 5 shared clinical @ (10) stations, 2 shared staff, 6 private offices, 1 swing office (#304) with 2 stations.

2.2.1.3. Tenure Faculty line: Spring '09 = 10, Fall '09 = 10, 2014 = 17

2.2.2. There is a required ratio of 1 faculty per 8 students required for accreditation.

2.2.3. There are 130 students.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. A surplus of area is being shown because the current faculty count and applied right size office area is less than the space allotted. It is anticipated that future faculty count and department growth will reconcile the existing vs. right size areas.

2.3.2. Need space for students to use laptops – students sit outside Rm #204 on floor. At the same time, there is student seating in the hallways that is not used.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. The new facility in Skinner allows for growth space.

3.2. Some staff will be leaving in July and will not be replaced immediately leaving more available office space.

3.3. There is a demand for nurses nationally. The UMass program student expansion is limited by the current number of faculty.

3.3.1. The nursing program is turning away students to keep to the 1:8 faculty/student ratio.

3.3.2. Nursing is expecting tenure faculty count to grow from 10 to 17 by 2014; (2) from stimulus, (3) funded in base budget, dean & assoc dean for research.

3.3.3. Nursing faculty must have MS degree for undergrad students, for masters students need doctorate degree to teach.

3.3.4. In order to be an accredited nursing program, the chief administrator must be a nurse & must have same authority as other administrators on campus.

3.3.5. There are over 1,200 student applicants, offer 75 placements, and get 64 regular bachelors.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.1.1.1. School of Nursing has consolidated in its entirety from 3 buildings into Skinner Hall.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

5.1. The facilities in Skinner are new and in excellent condition. There is no need to move.
6. Outline next steps

   6.1. Faculty and Student population counts are to be verified by the department and reported to Burt Hill.
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Attendees:  
CPPA, Lee Badgett – Chair  
SBS, Karen Schoenberger – Assistant Dean  
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova  
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1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
      1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
      1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
      1.3.3. Department location plans.
      1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
      1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
      2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Mission
The Center for Public Policy and Administration (CPPA) is the hub of interdisciplinary public policy research, teaching, and engagement at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. CPPA teaches and conducts rigorous research to realize social change and solve problems for the common good. CPPA faculty and alumni are effective policy leaders from the local to the global levels in addressing topics such as family and care policy, environmental issues, emerging technologies, social inequalities, and governance.

Academic programs
CPPA offers the following academic programs:
* Full- and part-time Masters of Public Policy and Administration (MPPA) programs
* Public policy and administration certificate program for University of Massachusetts undergraduate students. ¹

3.2. History
CPPA celebrated its tenth anniversary in 2008. The Center grew out of an earlier public administration master’s program in the political science department. In the mid-1990’s, Dean Glen Gordon of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (CSBS) commissioned a group to develop a new interdisciplinary program that would combine public policy analysis with public management skills. In 1998 we accepted our first class of students into the new CPPA program. While still housed in CSBS, CPPA is now truly an interdisciplinary program, with faculty from three colleges and ten departments. ¹

3.3. CPPA offers a Masters of Public Policy and Administration, 2 year program in a wide range of specialties and associations such as education, environmental policy, health policy, international/comparative policy, and family, gender and social policy. Students also have the opportunity to simultaneously earn certificates or joint degrees in Advanced Feminist Studies, Latin American, Caribbean and Latino Studies, or Management. ¹

3.4. A joint MPPA/MBA can also be attained. ¹

3.5. An undergraduate Certificate program is also offered to students in other programs. The certificate program could be developed.

3.6. Students are coming from a wide range of undergraduate degree backgrounds. Approximately ½ of the students are from out of state and a high percentage of international students are also enrolled.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Program Manager 1, Administrative Analyst 1, Clerk 1, Graduate Project Assistant 8, Graduate Research Assistant 10, Graduate Teaching Assistants, 1, Lecturer U of M 1, Research Fellow UM 1, Sr Financial/Budget Analyst 1, Student Employee 3; totaling 28. ²

4.2. Students: There are approximately 50 students in the MMPA program. 20 to 25 are admitted each year and they are ramping up to 30/yr. There are 244 total students in CPPA courses.

4.3. CPPA has s core faculty who are joint hires with other departments and teach the MPPA courses and electives, participate in the Center’s research and outreach activities, and advise CPPA students. In addition to its core faculty, CPPA has faculty associates from across the UMass campus. Faculty associates are faculty who are affiliated with the Center, who teach policy-related classes and/ or are available for research and collaboration.

¹ Information excerpted from CPPA Website.
² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
4.4. Faculty & Staff: 20 faculty. Mostly joint hires with other programs. 5 FTE. Memorandum of understanding are drafted with other departments for shared faculty.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. The department space is primarily on the 4th Floor of Thompson Hall with TA spaces in Basement of Thompson Annex. They also occupy a small amount of space on the 5th floor (a server closet) and a common area (Rm 612) next to the Latin American Studies space on the 6th floor.

5.2. Room 412 tends to be the identity space for the department and a gathering space for students. Students get displaced at times for departmental meetings and other scheduled uses.

5.3. There is a fundamental problem with the distance between grad students in the basement and main department space on the fourth floor.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. The Program has many campus affiliations such as Political Science, Economics, Resource Economics, Sociology, Communication, the business school etc.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None-noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. No specific plans but bringing grad students up from the Thompson basement could be a benefit of moving Sociology out of Thompson, freeing up additional space for CPPA and Political Science. Anthropology relocation in Machmer is key, however.

8.2. Thinking about relocating Stu Schulman Science & Technology, research project.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. Need touch-down spaces for interdisciplinary faculty from other departments to use when teaching at CPPA. A private room for meetings with Students is needed, not just work stations.

9.2. Lockable personal storage for grad students in Annex Basement.

9.3. Grad students need space or workstations for when they are working for the faculty in the main office suite.

9.4. Meetings and gathering Space.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. Photo/voice project is being run by Kathryn Sands, Environmental Policy.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. None noted

12. Department Research Program

12.1. Type of research requires more meeting space than lab/program rooms.
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Subject/Project Number: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
Center for Public Policy and Administration
New Academic Classroom Facilities  
University of Massachusetts – Amherst  
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1  
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number:  Meeting Date:  Project Phase:  Meeting Location:
2  5/12/09  9:00  Information Gathering  ST02  Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:  
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:  Distribution:
CPPA- Lee Badgett  
SBS- Karen Schoenberger  
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova  
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg  
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:
      2.3.1. CPPA has a Director, not a Chair.
3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
   3.1. Need touch-down space for visiting scholars or professors to meet with students; could be shared space.
   3.2. Research Room- meeting space for interdisciplinary faculty.
4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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Revised December 10, 2009 April 22, 2009

Subject/Project Number: College of Social and Behavioral Labor Center

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
1 Revised 3/23/09 Information Gathering Draper Hall 227
4:00 ST02

Meeting Purpose:
Labor Center, Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:
Labor Studies, Stephanie Luce – Chair Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova
SBS, Karen Schoenberger – Assistant Dean Pavlova, Alex Wing,
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova Michael Reagan
DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose
1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
   1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
   1.3.3. Department location plans.
   1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
   2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Founded in 1964, the Labor Relations and Research Center is an integrated program of graduate education, research, and direct service to workers and the labor movement. UMass Amherst offers a unique multi-disciplinary program that combines coursework and an internship toward an M.S. degree in Labor Studies. Coursework provides the skills necessary to work in the labor movement - expertise in organizing, collective bargaining, strategic corporate research, and union leadership - and you will have an opportunity to examine the larger theoretical and strategic issues confronting workers and their unions in the new millennium. 1

3.2. In 1995 the Center began offering an M.S. in Labor Studies in a limited-residency format for trade union officers, staff, and activists with this innovative program. Trade unionists attend ten-day residencies in summer and winter and can complete their Master's degree over a three-year period. The Union Leadership and Administration (ULA) program has quickly gained a national reputation and currently has more than one hundred trade unionists enrolled from across the U.S. and Canada. 1

3.3. 1 Masters degree program offered in 2 formats. One is a full time academic program providing training for labor union leaders, public agency advocates and other related fields. The other is a limited residency program which is an intensive program offered during the January/July intersession periods targeted toward working students.

3.4. 3 to 4 General Ed classes are also offered per year. 2 in the fall of about 70/ea. Larger courses of 120 are offered every semester but have not been taught recently. Gen. Ed. courses are taught by faculty limited schedules.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Program Coord, 1; Academic Program Manager, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 1; Clerk, 1; Departmental Assistant, 1; Dir, Labor Rel Res Ctr, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 5; Lecturer U of M, 2; Professor U of M, 1; Student Employee, 1; Totaling 15. 2

4.2. Students: 20 to 25 students enroll in the residential program. 100 in limited residential program. There tends to be only 50 at any given time.

4.3. Faculty: 3 tenure faculty.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Labor Center uses space owned by the Political Economy Research Institute (PERI) in Gordon Hall. Square footage has not been determined.

5.2. Classes are generally scheduled and held in Gordon Hall but they have to schedule back-up rooms on campus with the registrar (which they occasionally need to use) in case PERI needs their rooms, as a condition of their agreement with PERI. Graduate classes are typically long block.

5.3. They also use a UMass computer room.

5.4. The Center uses 2 to 3 classrooms full time in January in July (10 days each) for their limited residency programs similar to the School of Management for 35-50 people.

5.5. Room 216 in Gordon Hall has a 6 station computer lab which they have set up as their space.

---

1 Information excerpted from Labor Studies’ Website.
2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records
5.6. TA’s are in shared offices. They are currently replanning their office assignments.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

7. Current Relocations or Renovations
   7.1. No current plans.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
   8.1. Moving the program back on campus is an issue and would have benefits to the College who pay for maintenance and other PERI costs they should not bear.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
   9.1. Computer facilities as noted above.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives
    10.1. More information is needed.

11. Department Instructional Program
    11.1. Limited Residency Program is a continuing education program which is accommodated by PERI to reduce fees.

12. Department Research Program
    12.1. The Center’s faculty and staff also conduct national research about work and labor, including research on organizing, strategic campaigns, labor and community coalitions, living wage campaigns, and globalization. Much of this work has been funded by the labor movement. We also offer research services in support of organizing, bargaining, and in the policy arena for regional and local unions and state and central labor bodies.

    12.3. Towns & public agencies.
    12.4. Worker’s & Immigrant rights.
    12.5. Living wage research.
    12.6. Collaborates with PERI on workforce and labor research.
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From: Carol Harris

December 10, 2009

Subject/Project Number: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Labor Center

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/14/09 9:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: ST02
Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
SBS- Karen Schoenberger
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
   1.1. Revisions were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:
      4.2.1. There have been discussions of merging the Labor Center with Sociology.
5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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From: Joel E. Nordberg  
Subject/Project Number: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Number:</th>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>Project Phase:</th>
<th>Meeting Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/7/09</td>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>Draper Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>ST02</td>
<td>Rm 227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Purpose:

Legal Studies, Space Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees:</th>
<th>Distribution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Studies, ???</td>
<td>Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS, Karen Schoenberger -- Assistant Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass F&amp;CP, Ludmilla Pavlova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAM, Ann Storer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
       1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
       1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
       1.3.3. Department location plans.
       1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
       1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
       2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Legal Studies at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst provides an interdisciplinary approach to the study of law and society. As a department within the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Legal Studies offers its courses to the entire University and maintains a major for approximately four hundred students. The purposes of this multifaceted program are the development of the study of law within a liberal arts framework and the exploration of the myriad ways in which law study is connected with other disciplines pertinent to an understanding of society. ¹

3.2. One can say that Legal Studies is education about law, whereas law school is education in law. In fact, as a discipline, Legal Studies is based on the assumption that “law is too important to be left to lawyers.” The critical, humanistic approach of the program encourages students to investigate and develop their attitudes toward law and justice within the context of a growing literature of Legal Studies and related disciplines. ¹

3.3. Legal Studies is likely to become a program within a department such as Political Science or Sociology. As a program it would be similar in character to Journalism within Communications.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Administrative Analyst II, 1; Asst Professor U of M, 1; Departmental Assistant, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 5; Graduate Teaching Associate, 1; Instructor U of M, 2; Lecturer A, U of M, 1; Lecturer U of M, 7; Professor U of M, 2; Research Fellow UM, 2; Senior Lecturer U of M, 1; Student Employee, 7; totaling 31. ²

4.2. 5 Professors, 3 Lecturers, PT Lecturers, 5 TA. 7 PT & Graduates students who are bull-penned (stations stay the same but the people change with teaching assignments).

4.3. Department personnel are teaching faculty, many are UMass alumni.

4.4. There are 400 Under grad majors. Legal Studies is strictly an undergrad program.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Legal Studies is primarily located in Gordon Hall (area to be determined). They also have 422nsf in Draper Hall.

5.2. Gordon Hall is very high quality but not UMass Space, a situation that is becoming increasingly expensive and problematic. Costs are up to $260k/year, going to support Political Economy Research Institute (PERI) including $35 to $40k in building maintenance.

5.3. They work in space in Draper for the “Long Society Journal” which has 4 staff persons in 3 offices. 1 is an emeritus journal editor. There is also a copy room.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. The department should be more centrally located in Thompson with CPPA, Economics, Sociology, etc.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. No immediate plans.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

---

¹ Information excerpted from Legal Studies Website.
² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
8.1. A space request was made about 6 months ago to move Legal Studies and the Labor Center back on campus.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs


10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. More information needed.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. More information needed.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. Research efforts of faculty have included the impact of new information technologies on law, alternative dispute resolution, law and multinational corporations, law and popular culture, law and education, law and indigenous peoples, the legal profession, and law and education. The Department organizes a clinical project in conjunction with the Massachusetts Fair Housing Center (MFHC) -- there is a clinical project description, and an application form. It also sponsors the National Center for Technology and Dispute Resolution. The offices of the Law and Society Association are also affiliated with the Department, still located in our old home on the 2nd floor of Hampshire House.  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Number:</th>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>Project Phase:</th>
<th>Meeting Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/12/09</td>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>Facilities &amp; Campus Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>ST02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
Labor Center- Stephanie Luce
PERI-Judy Fogg
SBS- Karen Schoenberger
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
   1.1. (item 5.3) the journal in Draper is called the “Law and Society Journal”.
   1.2. (item 6.1) Department adjacencies should include Political Science.
   1.3. (item 12.1) The Law and Society Associated is located on the 2nd floor of Draper.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

4. Review Location Considerations:
4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

4.2.1. There are discussions of Legal Studies merging into Political Science.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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From: Joel E. Nordberg

Subject/Project Number: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Social Thought & Political Economy

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1  3/23/09  1:30
Project Phase: Information Gathering ST02
Meeting Location: Machmer E27A

Meeting Purpose:
Social Thought & Political Economy, Space Use

Attendees:
STPEC, Deborah Reiter, Program Coordinator
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing,
Michael Reagan

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. The Social Thought and Political Economy Program (STPEC) is an interdisciplinary undergraduate program in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. The STPEC Program encourages students to engage in a critical examination of society and to develop their own capacities for critical reading, writing, and thinking. STPEC students cross disciplinary lines to confront fundamental questions often ignored or neglected by traditional academic thought. ¹

3.2. Many of the issues STPEC students explore involve relations between individuals and society. STPEC courses may deal with issues such as freedom and the state, structural inequality in the economy, work and work relations, the relationship of Western to non-Western cultures, the interrelationship of racism, sexism, and class oppression, the psychodynamics of politics, and theories of social change. ¹

3.3. As STPEC students acquire an understanding of social relationships, they frequently develop a need to put their knowledge to work. Thus the Program also encourages its students to involve themselves in practice as well as theory by enrolling in internships as part of their undergraduate education, by playing a role in University and community affairs, and by assuming active responsibility for the shape of their own education within the STPEC Program. ¹

3.4. Students traditionally enter the program as juniors although sophomores can request course acceptance.

3.5. The basic program is structured around: Junior Seminar, Junior Writing, Senior Seminar; and Practicum with additional Colloquia and classes.

3.6. Students need 45 STPEC credits for their major.

3.7. An all undergraduate programs.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Center employee list is as follows: Academic Advisor, 1; Clerk ,1; Departmental Assistant, 1; Graduate Teaching Associate, 4; Lecturer U of M, 2; Student Employee, 1; totaling 10. ²

4.2. 20 to 25 students declared in their first year. Approximately 25 apply and transfer from other majors each year. There are about 150 students in the program, total.

4.3. Interdisciplinary Faculty: Seminars and instructors change every semester.

4.4. Sara Lennox is the STPEC, Chair

4.5. Junior Seminar Instructors (TAs)- 2. They would normally have had 3, including a writing instructor.

4.6. Classes are all seminars and range in size from 10 to 25.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Offices are in Machmer Hall (1,028 nsf) on the 2nd floor, east wing.

5.2. Air quality in offices is very bad and truck exhaust infiltrates the space. Office E27C needs a door directly into the reception area to avoid cutting through the adjacent office.

5.3. Classes are in Dickinson this year but have been in Machmer and other locations in the past.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

¹ Information excerpted from STPEC’s Website.
² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
6.1. Good to be near Arts and Humanities Advising, Economics and Political Science.
6.2. Good to be near the Student Union.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations
   7.1. None noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
   8.1. Have not thought about specific plans for relocating.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
   9.1. They need a classroom they can schedule but would probably share it with another department as they would
       not have enough teaching load for full time use.
   9.2. Their instructors prefer a seminar set up with chairs and tables.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives
    10.1. More information needed.

11. Department Instructional Program
    11.1. More information needed.

12. Department Research Program
    12.1. More information needed.
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Subject/Project Number: College of Social and Behavioral Science
Social Thought & Political Economy

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
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Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/21/09
Meeting Location: Information Gathering

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:
STPEC, Director- Sarah Lennox
STPEC- Deborah Reiter
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the Meeting Minutes #1:

1.1. Written comments to the meeting minutes were prepared by STPEC; copies were made and distributed to attendees.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

2.1.1. The department reception and library is set up like a living room in an attempt to encourage a place for student interaction and debate.

2.1.2. The lounge area is sometimes used as a conference space. Otherwise space is borrowed from other departments.

2.1.3. The study is the department library and is used as a conference room.

2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.2.1. Faculty count verified: 1 classified (office), 1 professional (office), 1 director (office), 1 associate director (office), 1/2 time Faculty has home in another office.
2.2.2. There are 5-10 student interns. These unpaid students need shared workstations. The 2 stations now are adequate.

2.2.3. There are 3 graduate employees TA’s (1 writing instructor and 2 junior seminars).

2.2.4. There are 3 visiting faculty that need shared office space.

2.2.5. The temporary employee does do advising and needs a private office.

2.2.6. The number of undergraduate students is between 140-150. There are no graduate students.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. A conference room for 15-18 people is needed.

2.3.2. File storage spread out through faculty and staff offices. A file storage room would be useful.

2.3.3. There is need for dedicated seminar space for junior and senior @ 20 students (8 classes @ 3hrs/wk).

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. The department would like open debate among students and faculty to be encouraged on campus. The lounge/living room space in the department is the only one of its kind on campus.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

4.2.1. STPEC likes being near the arts & sciences advising center.

4.2.2. The department identifies more with the Social Sciences rather than the Humanities.

4.2.3. There are many interdisciplinary program possibilities: Women’s Studies, Latin American Studies, Anthropology, BDIC/Commonwealth College, Afro-American Studies.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

5.1. The condition of Machmer is poor. Complaints include health concerns.

6. Outline next steps
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DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose
1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
1.3.3. Department location plans.
1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. **Department Background Information**

3.1. The Department of Anthropology was established in 1969. At the University of Massachusetts Amherst, the Anthropology Department is a four-field program, each concerned with one of the main branches of Anthropology: Archaeology, Biological Anthropology, Cultural Anthropology, and Linguistic Anthropology.  

3.2. Anthropology is the study of humanity in the broadest sense. Anthropology examines the nature and significance of human diversity in its biological, historical, and cultural forms. This examination is both a scientific and a humanistic undertaking and, inevitably, students of anthropology apply what they learn to understand and ameliorate social conditions here and elsewhere and to preserve and to interpret cultural resources from the past. Anthropology thus straddles the social sciences and human biology in its theories and methods and the interpretive traditions of the humanities as well. Anthropology regularly challenges conventional views that regularly mystify, categorize, or essentialize human diversity by race, gender, language, nationality, and class.  

3.3. Traditionally, anthropology has been considered a four-field discipline: archaeology, cultural anthropology, linguistics, and physical anthropology. The merging of these rather disparate concerns arose in the context of the development of the American research university in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The tendency is for each of these sub-fields to be treated as independent of one another. However, we believe that one who is sensitive to the interplay of the past and the present, biology and culture, symbols and action, is most likely to come to a distinctively anthropological understanding of the human condition--one that appreciates both the holism and the diversity of the ways of being human.

3.4. In cultural anthropology the general focus is on the interplay of culture, history, and personal identity, both here in America, and in other social settings around the world. Cultural anthropologists produce ethnographies richly developed written and/or filmed descriptions of real people in specific social, historical, and cultural settings. Courses in cultural anthropology emphasize the reading, viewing, and comparing of ethnographies to discern what is common and what is different among human groups, and then to account for both similarities and differences.

3.5. Archeology has a very similar objective, except that both the time frame and the kinds of evidence are different. Archaeologists are interested in explaining and interpreting cultural change on the basis of what may be gleaned from the material remnants of human behaviors in the past ecological changes, tools, settlements, and artistic and monumental productions, often laid bare through excavation. Archaeologists are acutely aware that the interpretation of the past is fraught with contemporary social and political consequences, so they aim to be as inclusive yet rigorous as possible.

3.6. Biological anthropology examines both human origins and variability, and seeks to construct and interpret the processes of evolution and history whereby humans have assumed their current biological pre-eminence among all animals. Further biological anthropologists are interested in understanding the factors that explain human biological diversity in the world at the present, whether in the way our bodies look and work, in the ways they develop and change over the life span, and in how we exhibit health and disease. Biological anthropologists at UMass have been in the forefront internationally in contesting efforts to construe human biological diversity with the culturally constituted categories termed Ôraces.

3.7. Linguistic anthropology is a specialized branch of cultural anthropology with a singular focus on the most systematic domain of culture: language. Language is not only a medium of a communication, but it also

---

1 Information excerpted from Anthropology Website.
structures thought and the perception of reality. Further language use defines social communities, whether differences lie at the level of language or dialect. Linguistic anthropologists describe languages now in use or used in the past, trace language change over time and space, and examine the social and political import of language usage.  

3.8. Archeological Services is a separate, private entity in Machmer within the Anthropology Department space.  

4. Department Headcount (Population)  
4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Administrative Analyst III, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 5; Asst Professor U of M, 7; Chrm. of Department U of M, 1; Clerks 4; Graduate Fellowships, 1; Graduate Research Assistant, 7; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 18; Graduate Teaching Associate, 1; Lecturer U of M, 5; Professor U of M, 5; Senior Lecturer U of M, 1; Student Employee, 9; Totaling 65. 

4.2. A breakdown of the Archeological Services employee list is as follows: Archaeologist, 1; Bookkeeper I, 1; Clerk IV, 1; Departmental Assistant, 30; Graduate Research Assistant, 1; Intern, 1; Research Assistant, 2; Research Professor A, 1; Senior Archaeologist, 1; Student Employee, 3; Technical Assistant II, U of M, 1; Totaling 43. 

4.3. All faculty have Anthropology degrees in one of 4 concentration. They are dedicated to maintaining both Bachelor and Post Graduate degree programs.  

4.4. An understanding is needed of what faculty members work in Physical Anthropology with science lab needs. 

4.5. 20 faculty, 4 office staff. 20 TAs, Lecturers.  

5. Current Location and Space Conditions  
5.1. Anthropology occupies 16,270 sf in 5 locations: Machmer Hall, 12,246; Photo Lab, 665; Phy Plant Trailer, 1,020; South College, 1,038; and, Thompson, 1,301.  

5.2. Difficulty I distinguishing between classrooms with flexible uses and class labs. Some classrooms have collection storage cases for example.  

5.3. There are sensitive, climate controlled storage needs that would be hard to accommodate in the Machmer building.  

5.4. E16 is colored as a UMass classroom but is an Anthropology instructional space.  

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)  
6.1. Other Social and Behavioral Science departments.  

6.2. Physical Anthropology’s science lab needs are not appropriate in the Machmer building but it would be very undesirable to split the Department by moving them away from the other concentrations to more science based facilities.  

6.3. The parking garage and Campus Center relationships are key benefits to current location.  

6.4. Media production spaces is needed. Students currently go to the Learning Center or OIT but the demand is very high and use is very limited.  

6.5. Moving specimens and projects across campus to available teaching spaces is not practical or good specimen care practice.  

6.6. Most TAs are assigned to very poor space in the South College Basement. TAs also meet with students in the Thompson Café.  

7. Current Relocations or Renovations  
7.1. None noted.

---

2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records
8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
   8.1. None noted.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
   9.1. Collections and storage need with appropriate climate control. Collections must have growth space as artifacts are not disposed of.
   9.2. Seminar, lecture space that they can control over fixed schedule blocks. They have had to schedule off campus on occasions when it would seem that (evening) space had in fact been available.
   9.3. Bob Paynter, E17, has particular science lab needs such as a fume hood, science sinks, etc. A list will be created by the department.
   9.4. Faculty will be polled to get information on what level of laboratory space fit out is needed to better suite pedagogical needs.
   9.5. Current spaces are not technologically “smart enough” and lack adequate AV including room darkening for multimedia.
   9.6. Multimedia production lab facilities are in greater demand. They are needed or digital presentation, photography integration in reports, etc. Communications Department facilities are fully scheduled and cannot meet their need. A multi user facility could work but the conflict between a production facility used to teach (scheduled) does not overlap well facility that supports research and projects.
   9.7. Statistics related, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology is becoming more prevalent in Anthropology and Archeology and a computer lab with specialized software is needed for teaching.
   9.8. Besides being inappropriate for the artifacts, specimen storage in the current fashion, takes up space that could otherwise be used for teaching or other academic needs.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives
   10.1. More information is needed.

11. Department Instructional Program
   11.1. Lectures and presentations by visiting scholars tend to be in poor quality space in Machmer or Thompson 6th floor (620). These programs could range in size from 10 to 50 people. They often rent space in the Campus Center and have, at times, had to go off Campus.
   11.2. Looking for presentation and special lecture space is a major time drain.

12. Department Research Program
   12.1. More information is needed.
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Meeting Purpose:

Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:

Sociology- Jackie Urla
SBS- Karen Schoenberger
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Distribution:

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the 12 March meeting minutes.
   1.1. (item 4.4) The Wilson study assesses Physical Anthropology; copies of the report were made and distributed.
   1.2. (item 8.1) The Wilson study did make a proposal to move to Furnald or French. It was decided that French was too small and Furnald was too difficult to convert into proper lab space.
   1.3. (item 9.6) Need audio/visual lab similar to linguistics lab space (multi-media space). Recordings are being brought in from the field and need to be processed.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

   2.1.1. Some of the existing space data is not correct. F&CP is in the process of updating the Horizon database and should be correcting this. When this update is completed it will be issued to BH for incorporation into the report.

   2.1.2. Offices in Machmer are large. The right-sizing in the report makes offices smaller and consistent with the university standards.

   2.1.3. Physical Plant trailer space moving to Cold Storage.
2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.2.1. SBS will review the personnel list and comment.

2.2.2. Faculty tenure line

2.2.2.1. Spring ’09 = 19, Fall ’09 = 18, 2014 = 20

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. Collection storage facility

2.3.1.1. Space is used for teaching as well as storage. BH to provide a right-sizing of classroom space then add a 3’ perimeter for collections storage. Anthropology to provide linear foot of collections storage and liner sf per student workspace.

2.3.2. Storage space Rm E17. A list of furniture and equipment needs has been documented by SBS; copies made and distributed to attendees.

2.3.3. Faculty teaching archeology take field items, work on them then curate them. Class lab for archaeology.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. See attachment.

3.2. Anthropology is in need for classroom space.

3.3. Physical Anthropology needs lab space.

3.3.1. Linguistics and Cultural Anthropology need audio/visual lab similar to those used for linguistics. A computer lab (8-12 stations) could be shared with archaeology for data cataloging and GIS media, graduate student lab, digital research lab, with software provided for audio/visual, etc.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.1.1. Anthropology wants to stay together as one department. If the department is to move, it should be moved in its’ totality.

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

4.2.1. Anthropology crosses between the sciences and humanities. May be some advantages to moving it closer to the sciences.

4.2.2. Machmer may be a good location, but upgrades required especially to create appropriate lab space. If renovate Machmer need swing space.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

6. Outline next steps

6.1. Anthropology will review and comment on personnel/population counts.

6.2. Anthropology will provide scheduling for class and non class labs to Lu.

6.3. BH will update the right-size with new Horizon data when made available.
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Space Needs

Archaeology Lab and Small Classroom for fieldschool and artifact analysis

Place for storing artifacts

Cold storage for artifacts that have been analyzed but not being currently worked on
Movable storage.

Lab space with storage for artifacts being worked on.

Large tables on wheels, that can be assembled or taken apart

3 large tables approx 7x 4 feet

Modicum of temperature control – not to exceed 90 degrees F.
Glue can melt. Faunal remains

Ventilation for certain tests. Need a hood for an area 4 x 3 approx.

Need large sink with water, counter space near it.

Secure storage for chemicals – cabinetry

Need light blocking shades. UV is damaging to artifacts

More electrical outlets

Ethernet connections

Ground level

Wheel barrow accessible

Multiple work stations with desk, chair, lighting for research assistants
Approx. 3
Secure storage for microscopes, micrometers, cameras

Cab space for bags

Projection Screen

**Repatriation Space**

Human skeletal remains and artifacts. Needs temperature control consistent with physical labs

Rolling storage for all labs –

Room for lab tables (1-2)

Most remains are algonkian, believe they are animate beings, to be disturbed as little as possible. Therefore no meetings in this space.

Consults with native descendants require chairs to be able to spend time with the remains or objects.

Needs to remain close to Anthropology Dept. for consults and monitoring.

Could have to be repurposed or partitioned in the future.

Should be a space that could accommodate ceremonial smudging (burning of incense and smoke).

Needs a sink, for washing of artifacts.

**Public Display Space is Lacking**

2 x 3 cabinets in anteroom, seminar room
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SBS, Karen Schoenberger – Assistant Dean
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova
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Ann Storer, Ludmilla
Pavlova, Alex Wing,
Michael Reagan

1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
      1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
      1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
      1.3.3. Department location plans.
      1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
      1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher
         education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
      2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and
              department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building
              and renovations of existing buildings.
      2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new
              building.
2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. The Department offers an undergraduate major in Communication, M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Communication, and an undergraduate major in Journalism. There are currently 22 tenure-track faculty in Communication and six in Journalism. The Department is searching for 5 new tenure-line faculty during 2008-9.

3.2. Departmental governance is organized around a committee structure. Faculty are appointed by the Chair to serve on a variety of administrative committees. A Personnel Committee is elected each year.

3.3. The undergraduate major in Communication is large and popular, with over 800 majors. Entry to the major is restricted. About 40% of the majors are admitted directly from high school; current UMass undergraduates wishing to become majors must take two entry-level Communication courses and establish at least a B-minus average G.P.A. in their first year or two. Unlike the Communication programs at many colleges, our curriculum is not technical or skills-based. We offer only one course in public speaking, and students can count only two courses in TV/film production toward their major requirements. We offer no courses in applied industry training such as advertising or public relations. Freshmen and sophomores are generally in lecture classes (with no discussion sections). Juniors and seniors take much smaller classes and seminars that are restricted to junior and senior Communication majors.

3.4. Although undergraduate Communication majors do not specify a “track” or sub-discipline (and, indeed, are required to take courses across these boundaries), most coursework falls in one of the following intellectual areas: social interaction, intercultural and global communication, film studies, critical/cultural studies, technology and “new” media studies, media policy and media institutions, media effects and mass communication, and rhetoric and performance studies.

3.5. The Communications program is in demand but limited by the facilities.

3.6. Burt Hill was asked to provide comparables for similar programs in other schools.

3.7. All classes are reserved for Communications Majors.

3.8. Many of the courses held in the screening room of South College are not major track courses.

3.9. New Chair to be announced within the next week.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department (Communications and Journalism) employee list is as follows: Academic Adviser 1, Administrative Analyst 1, Assoc Professor U of M 9, Asst Professor U of M 6, Audio Visual Equip Tech 1, Audio/Visual Supervisor 1, Chrm.Of Department U of M 1, Clerical Assistant 1, Clerks 3, Departmental Assistant 1, Graduate Project Assistant 1, Graduate Research Assistant 7, Graduate Teaching Assistants 24, Graduate Teaching Associate 15, Intern 1, Lecturer A, U of M 2, Lecturer U of M 21, Professor U of M 11, Senior Lecturer U of M 2, Student Employee 8, Typist 1; totaling 118.

4.2. There are about 75 M.A. and Ph.D. students in the Communication graduate program, with about 35-40 actively taking classes. About 85% have completed a M.A. elsewhere and are admitted as doctoral students. Admission to the graduate program is highly competitive. In the last 5 years, the Department has received as many as 190 applications in a year, and the admission rate has ranged from 10 to 20%. Incoming classes have ranged from 8 to 12 students during this period. Generally, all incoming students are funded. The department offers no fellowships, only Teaching Assistantships and an occasional Research Assistantship. The strongest candidates sometimes receive University Fellowships that do not require that the student work as a TA. An M.A. is required for admission to the Ph.D. program; M.A. students who wish to go on for the Ph.D. must complete a subsequent application. Graduate students come from many different countries from around the globe.
4.3. Students: 1105 Primary Majors, 87 Secondary Majors, 7 masters degree, and, 67 Doctoral degrees.

4.4. 36 Production class students.

4.5. Faculty & Staff (Communications): 4 Professors; 1 Professors Emeritus; 5 Associate Professors; 8 Assistant Professors; 2 Distinguished Professors; 3 Lecturers; 6 Research Center Managers & Assistants; 2 Senior Research Fellow; and, 2 Administrative Assistants (shared with SDPPSA) = 33 total.

4.6. Faculty tends to be split between those doing computer research and those who are actively teaching.

4.7. Faculty typically teach two courses each semester. Faculty serving in major administrative posts (Undergraduate Studies Director, Graduate Program Director) normally carry a 2-1 course load.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Communications Occupies 12,344 nsf (8,677 in Machmer, 3,194 in South College, 473 in Photo Lab and the Studio in the Basement of Herter Annex (sf to be determined)). All of the space is in poor condition.

5.2. Communications gave up South College 108 Screening Room with the understanding that the room is now UMass scheduled. It was not clear whether the space is used at this time. They are using the library screening rooms and dividing classes to fit into available smaller spaces.

5.3. They have also moved editing out of South College to the basement of the Herter Annex.

5.4. Graduate student are in offices in Machmer, 3rd floor which has recently been renovated to classroom ready space with demountable office systems fit-out. They have most of the Fourth Floor, east wing. There is a common perception of environmental problems on the floor, however.

5.5. Accessibility – the entire department is in inaccessible space in every building with the exception of the studio in the basement of Herter which technically can be reached from the elevators in the main Herter building.

5.6. Journalism space in basement of Bartlett has a large number of windowless offices.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. General collaboration with most SBS departments; CPPA, Political Science, Anthropology, Psychology and others.

6.2. There are as many or more collaboration with the 5 Colleges as there are within the University.

6.3. Having the studio located in the basement of Herter is as big an obstacle as the split between Journalism and Communications. The faculty see it as hidden away and do not recognize it as a resource.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None noted

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. None noted

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. The production studio space could be used by other departments if configured correctly.

9.2. The current studio is all analog. There needs to be a digital studio and editing facility as well. The department has done some planning and will forward equipment requirements to Lu.

9.3. They would like to teach active video production and need digital editing and screening facility.

9.4. A screening room needs a capacity of 80 plus. The screening room in South College has held up to 60.

9.5. Production has 36 students (3 classes of 12) per semester.

9.6. The editing suite is a lab type environment. Students working on projects use it in as an unscheduled resource.

9.7. Pod casting space should also be created to follow industry trends.

9.8. Meetings space is needed for groups of approximately 25.

9.9. Looking for other comparables for schools that teach Cultural Studies and Production. Central Texas was noted to be production orientated. Annanberg is more Cultural Studies oriented.

9.10. Faculty meeting space is needed.
9.11. They should also have a live television and TiVo set up.
9.12. Space is needed for other types of focus groups, community service programs, computer work, etc.
9.13. A student project computer room is needed.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives
   10.1. None noted.

11. Department Instructional Program
    11.1. Working with a 5 college film series.

12. Department Research Program
    12.1. They have a Focus Group using 331 Machmer.
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1. Purpose
1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
   1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
   1.3.3. Department location plans.
   1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
   2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Journalism is a major that prepares its students to work in newspapers, broadcast and online, as well as in other professions, such as public relations, teaching and law. Our students come to us wanting to make a difference in the world, and we strive to prepare them to do just that. We believe that good journalism is essential to democracy, and we are committed to communicating that not only to those students who will work in the field but to all students who as citizens of this society will rely on journalism to understand their government and the world around them. Journalism students take about 75 percent of their coursework in the humanities and social and natural sciences, which further broadens and deepens their intellectual perspective and curiosity.  

3.2. Our Journalism program has always emphasized the teaching of good writing, as well as a range of other necessary skills. Our courses include writing for print, broadcast and the Web, and our students are introduced to convergence journalism—the notion of telling stories not only through the written word but through podcasts, vodcasts and mash-ups. Still, the hallmark of all of our courses is a focus on clarity of thought and critical inquiry. Students study the foundations of our field—history, law, media criticism and ethics—which are even more essential in this new world of the 24/7 deadline. We also encourage our students to do local, regional and national internships and to be involved with campus media.  

3.3. Our highly accomplished faculty is committed to teaching. We pride ourselves on our student-centered major: teaching small, interactive classes, knowing our students personally and maintaining relationships with our alumni, who work in newsrooms from the New York Times to the Boston Globe, from NBC to NPR, from Yankee Magazine to stateline.org to the Associated Press. Among our six full-time faculty members are winners of the Pulitzer Prize, the Freedom Forum Journalism Teacher of the Year Award and two winners of the UMass Distinguished Teaching Award. All of us have been working journalists, and we continue to do both journalism and scholarly research. Our scholarly interests range from literary journalism to new media to community journalism to women in journalism history. We work with more than a dozen adjuncts who include editors, reporters and anchors at regional newspapers, magazines, radio and television stations and new media.  

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department (Communications and Journalism) employee list is as follows: Academic Adviser 1, Administrative Analyst 1, Assoc Professor U of M 9, Asst Professor U of M 6, Audio Visual Equip Tech 1, Audio/Visual Supervisor 1, Chrm.Of Department U of M 1, Clerical Assistant 1, Clerks 3, Departmental Assistant 1, Graduate Project Assistant 1, Graduate Research Assistant 7, Graduate Teaching Assistants 24, Graduate Teaching Associate 15, Intern 1, Lecturer A, U of M 2, Lecturer U of M 21, Professor U of M 11, Senior Lecturer U of M 2, Student Employee 8, Typist 1; totaling 118.  

4.2. Students: 500 Majors. Labs sizes are generally 13, 15, 30 or 40 seats.

4.3. Faculty & Staff: 22 Faculty and staff. No grad students. Expecting to get another full time faculty hire.

4.4. Housed in Bartlett: 9 Faculty, 1 Emeritus Faculty, 2 Professional Staff.  

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Journalism offices and one classroom are on the first floor of Bartlett and occupy 2,746 nsf.

---

1 Information excerpted from Journalism’s Website.

2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records (Including 12 Journalism faculty & Staff)

3 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records
5.2. Their one classroom (rm 107) is fully scheduled.
5.3. They maintain a high concentration of students in their Bartlett location.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)
6.1. Works closely with the Office of Information Technology.
6.2. Political Science and CPPA as well as other departments in the School of Behavioral Sciences and Humanity and Fine Arts departments.
6.3. They rely heavily on the multi media facilities in the Library.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations
7.1. None noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
8.1. None noted

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
9.1. Another (general) classroom of the size of Room 107 or larger (30 to 40 seats). This is essential to bring their students together for sense of community and collaboration.
9.2. A flexible layout computer lab (13 to 15) 25 sf/person is needed.
9.3. They should also be able to provide an office for visiting lecturers.
9.4. They need an administrative person as they currently serve 22 faculty and 3,500 students without one.
9.5. They also need a central student space for informal gatherings and collaboration to reinforce a central program identity.
9.6. A broadcast studio and production/editing room (David Maxcy, Communications/AV).
9.7. American University, Kent State, Indiana University, ACT, Emerson & BU have all just opened state of the art broadcast facilities.
9.8. An editing/production room. Should be wired and not wireless due to files sizes.
9.9. Need more of a News Room space. Indiana model has desks around the parameter facing the wall with a conference table in the middle. Set up should be for approximately 15 stations.
9.10. Printers and external hard drives are needed for student projects. Also projectors and readily accessible power.
9.11. 4 or 5, 2 to 3 station sound proof rooms for narratives and voice over dubbing.
9.12. Quiet work/study space is also needed.
9.13. The program could grow significantly and immediately if more space and faculty were available. Larger classrooms are difficult. Most students are coming out of the small writing class environment and more immediate contact between students and instructors better suites the program.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives
10.1. More information needed.

11. Department Instructional Program
11.1. Journalism is becoming more multimedia focused. Teaching and facilities must expand to reflect this.
11.2. Writing for multi-platform (video) outlets. A good facility could be used by other departments. Sound proof facilities for recording and television.
11.3. They have understood that a studio is being built in the Library.
11.4. Broadcasting works out of Lederle. UVC (University Cable TV).

11.5. Amherst Wired .com, a connection to regional media outlets. Students work on this on their own time.

11.6. Entrepreneurial Journalism - working with students in non-traditional media outlets such as starting up their own web sites.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. More information needed.
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Social and Behavioral Sciences
Communications/Journalism

New Academic Classroom Facilities
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Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:

2 5/12/09 Information Gathering Facilities & Campus Planning
3 5/12/09 Information Gathering Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:

Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:

Communications, Interim Chair - Doug Anderton
SBS - Karen Schoenberger
Journalism - Steve Fox
Journalism - Karen List
UMass F&CP - Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM - Ann Storer
Burt Hill - Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the Communications - 23 March and Journalism - 2 April meeting minutes were conveyed.
   1.1. Communications emphasizes that there is not enough undergraduate advising spaces. Student advising now happens in offices of other staff.
   1.2. Journalism has no revisions to report.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

   2.1.1. Communications and Journalism are currently located in different buildings but are apart of the same department.

   2.1.2. Spaces are cramped and do not allow for department growth.

   2.2. Population & Personnel List
2.2.1. Faculty tenure lines, Journalism: June 2009 = 5, Sept 09 = 5, 2014 = 6.

2.2.2. Faculty tenure line, Communications: June 09 = 22, Sept 09 = 22, 2014 = 24.

2.2.3. Anticipating significant growth in lecturers.

2.2.3.1. Journalism, June 09 = 3, Sept 09 = 4, 2014 = 6.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. Communications and Journalism are to operate their programs independently and maintain their own identity, but may be able to share spaces such as administration, faculty break room, storage, and some technical space (pod casting, studio, etc.).

2.3.2. It is important to create separate undergraduate hubs that include entries, waiting areas, and advising spaces for each program.

2.3.2.1. Waiting spaces are places for students to interact with each other as well as to work. Given the amount of students in these programs the spaces should be large.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. Both Comm & Journalism are restricted majors. The university wants departments to grow. The existing spaces now prohibit department growth. Need classroom, screening rooms, studios to support additional students.

3.2. Journalism needs – Broadcast (large studio), documentary space, multiple soundproof areas (5-6), film, web design (video & audio), pod cast space (multiple), and large open classroom space. These areas may be shared with Communications.

3.3. Multi-media production space is required for Comm/Journalism that is superior to a computer lab (which requires only software and projector) and can provide broadcast level production.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.1.1. Communications and Journalism should be located in close proximity to each other and be consolidated into one building. The current situation of being separated in different buildings does not work for the department.

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

4.2.1. Comm/Journalism do not need adjacency to other departments, just to each other.

4.2.2. The programs want distinct identities for each, but may share spaces that make sense.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

5.1. Department needs are so specialized and technology needs are so great that it would not fit into any of the existing buildings on campus. Drastic renovations to an existing facility would be required to suit the department’s needs.

5.2. Benchmark facilities for Journalism can be found at: American University, Kent State and Indiana.
5.3. If good facilities are provided, the draw of students to the university will be great.

6. Outline next steps

6.1. Comm/journalism to confirm Personnel counts as of June 09, Sept 09 and 2014 (25%).

6.2. Journalism to provide out of state student percentage. Creates a destination department and creates loyal alumni.
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Meeting Number: 1
Meeting Date: 3/23/09
1:30
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Draper Hall
ST02
Rm 227

Meeting Purpose:

Economics, Space Use

Attendees: Economic, Diane Flaherty – Chair
Economics – Judy Dietel – Staff Assistant
UMass F&CP, Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
   1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
   1.3.3. Department location plans.
   1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
   2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. (Under Graduate) Economics is the study of human energy—how we organize our efforts to get what we want. Market exchange plays a central role in this process, but processes of conflict and coordination that take place outside of markets are also important. Economics contains two broad sub-disciplines. Microeconomics analyzes the individual behavior of households, business firms, and governmental entities. Macroeconomics focuses upon aggregate economic performance of nations and their interdependencies in the global economy.\(^1\)

3.2. (Post Graduate and Doctoral) Programs provides students with a sophisticated and critical grounding in economic analysis, so that they can contribute creatively to research, teaching, and social policy. This commitment has gained the Department an international reputation as a center of research in innovative approaches to economics.\(^1\)

The entering graduate class consists of ten to twelve students each year. The focus of the Department, as well as its policy of maintaining small classes and promoting close contact between faculty and students, has permitted the program to attract talented students on a par with other highly selective graduate programs in the country.\(^1\)

The students are of diverse backgrounds, nationality, gender, and race. They are drawn by the program's strengths in such areas as political economy, development economics, international economics, economic history, gender and class, labor economics, comparative economic systems, and growth and distribution as well as in theoretical and applied micro-and macroeconomics. This leads to a breadth of perspective unusual among graduate programs in economics.\(^1\)

Students can work with faculty on research employing a variety of approaches to economics, including neoclassical, Marxist, institutionalist, feminist, and post-Keynesian approaches. The faculty's research interests include pure theory, empirical work, and policy analysis.\(^1\)

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Adviser, 1; Administrative Analyst, 1; Asc Dir, Latin American Studies, 1; Assoc Professors U of M, 3; Asst Professors U of M, 3; Chrm. Of Department U of M, 1; Clerks, 2; Departmental Assistant, 1; Graduate Research Assistant, 5; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 29; Graduate Teaching Associate, 11; Lecturer U of M, 5; Professor U of M, 13; Senior Lecturer, 2; Sr Computer Specialist, 1; Student Employee, 16; Typist, 1; Totaling 96.\(^2\)

4.2. Faculty 20 and hoping for 2 new hires

4.3. 70 to 90 Grad Students, most assist in teaching, some in research. They are typically housed 2 to 3/office.

4.4. 200 declared Economics Major. Space and faculty limit course offerings and students sometimes drop the major when they can’t get the courses they need to meet the requirements.

4.5. 3500 Gen Ed students taking Economics courses.

4.6. Could increase majors and grow the program with more space and faculty.

4.7. Students do not generally come into the program early. They are seeing a large contingency of Engineering students moving over to Economics.

\(^1\) Information excerpted from Economics Website.

\(^2\) Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
5. **Current Location and Space Conditions**
   5.1. The Department occupies 9,485 sf in the Thompson Tower floors 8, 9 and 10.
   5.2. Conference room 821 is severely undersized.
   5.3. Room 940 is used for visiting scholars.
   5.4. Rooms 502 & 504 have been given up to Political Science.
   5.5. Thompson’s narrow corridors are very constricting to the students and faculty.
   5.6. The Thompson space is very tough for student to get oriented in.
   5.7. Toilet spaces are very sub-standard and dimensionally constrained. The first floor toilets have been renovated to be accessible, however they serve the whole building.
   5.8. The 10th floor is “Department Central” but the department lacks an identity, nucleus space.

6. **Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)**
   6.1. Collaborations exist with other SBS Departments, Resource Economics, the Business school, CPPA, etc.
   6.2. The current central campus location is good.

7. **Current Relocations or Renovations**
   7.1. None noted.

8. **Proposed Relocations or Renovations**
   8.1. A large contingency of retiring faculty will open up office space.
   8.2. Room 919 needs to be refurbished. They would like to take an adjacent office for expansion.

9. **Department Space and Technology Needs**
   9.1. They would like to enlarge their ninth floor conference room.
   9.2. Research tends to be individual, office based, however, spaces that would bring people out of their private offices and into a more collaborative environment would be welcome.
   9.3. Collaborative meeting space is needed (larger than the 10th floor space).
   9.4. The computer lab is available on the first floor but is not well used by students.
   9.5. They need student access to printers on their floor.
   9.6. Up dated AV equipment is needed in their conference room 919. Projectors, monitors, smart boards, etc. Rooms are Department controlled.
   9.7. A larger, department controlled seminar, conference, graduate class & undergraduate seminar room(s) is needed.
   9.8. Available auditoria in the 100 seat range would open up enrollements.

10. **Department and /or Faculty Initiatives**
    10.1. Strong environmental programs and focus on creating green jobs.
    10.2. Macro-economists.

11. **Department Instructional Program**
    11.1. They would like to see smaller seminar classes. Looking at 20 to 25. Currently smallest are 32 to 37.
    11.2. They would be willing to expand class sizes into larger auditorium classes from 64 to 96. The lack of available 90 to 120 auditoria classrooms prevents this at this time.
    11.3. Economics is pick-up Business School overflow students who do not get acceptance into the Business School.
11.4. Undergraduate Economics Club (UEC).

11.5. They traditionally have a lot of trouble getting classrooms, even to the point of not being able to teach the courses they want teach.

11.6. They are using interactive “clickers” (personal response systems) in some classrooms.

12. Department Research Program
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New Academic Classroom Facilities
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Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/28/09
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:
Economics- Diane Flaherty
Economics- Judy Deitel
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the Meeting Minutes #1.
   1.1. No comments noted.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
      2.1.1. Existing area data needs to be updated. Some of the spaces shown were given to Political Science. The Horizon Database is being updated by Facilities Planning which shall give a better depiction of current areas.
      2.1.2. Room # 821 is a computer room with 8 stations. The space is cramped and is also used as a mail room.
      2.1.3. Room # 808 and 810 are used as faculty offices.
      2.1.4. Room # 104 is used as general waiting and department break-out area.
2.1.5. Room # 1019 has supplies, collating table, file storage, and photo copiers. It could be a good work room if it were larger.

2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.2.1. Tenure faculty line

2.2.1.1. Spring ‘09 = 20, Fall ‘09 = 22 (1 for Jan ’10), 2014 = 28

2.2.2. The faculty peak was in the late ‘90’s @ 31.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. An undergraduate and a graduate advising office separate from faculty offices is needed.

2.3.2. The temporary employee currently has a private office now. This office is used for sensitive scheduling and needs to remain as a private and secure space.

2.3.3. 4-5 Graduate students currently share a single office. This is cramped since they do meet students in their offices. 3 graduate students to an office would be ideal.

2.3.4. A separate file room for department files is needed. Currently, department files are stored in faculty offices. There is some department storage in the basement that is full, more space is needed.

2.3.5. The undergraduate Economics Club needs student organization space @150sf.

2.3.6. The department has conference room space at 300sf (#1028) and 670sf (#919). An additional seminar space @ 800 sf for 40 people is needed.

2.3.7. A graduate student lounge for 10 people is needed. The current lounge in room #829 only fits 2 chairs and a table.

2.3.8. Need a computer room with 12 stations, currently have 8.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. The department cannot hire new faculty without providing office space. Un-assigned office space needs to be added so the department can grow.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.1.1. The department has been consolidated into 3 adjacent floors in Thompson. If additional space were to be added, it should be contiguous to the existing spaces.

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

6. Outline next steps
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Subject/Project Number: Landscape Architecture
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Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1
Meeting Date: 3/31/09
11:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Hills 301

Meeting Purpose:
Landscape Architecture, Space Use

Attendees:
LARP, – Elizabeth Brabuc, Chair
LARP, – Terry Trudeau, Office Manager
NRE – Martha Baker, Assistant Dean
NRE - Patti Cromack, Assistant Director
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova, Susan Personette, Pam Rooney
Provost – Bryan Harvey
DCAM , Ann Storer
Burt Hill , Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose
1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
   1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
   1.3.3. Department location plans.
   1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
   2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Our mission is to educate planners and landscape architects about planning and design policies, concepts and practices that meet human, social and economic needs while respecting the ecological integrity of the environment. We do this through an integrated program of teaching, research, and outreach using the New England landscape as a laboratory for inquiry and instruction. We serve the strategic growth and management interests of the larger region, the Commonwealth, and its local cities and towns.  

3.2. Undergraduate Program: Our fundamental concern is the wise use of land and natural resources. As the public becomes increasingly aware and sophisticated about environmental issues, opportunities for professional landscape architects increase rapidly. The landscape industry across the state is booming through historic preservation, recreation and other public construction; in addition, there is extensive business and residential building in the private sector. Each of these developments requires professional expertise in landscape architecture, and our program is designed to meet this tremendous need. 

3.3. Landscape architecture at the University of Massachusetts is a professional degree program. Upon graduation you will have the knowledge and skills necessary to work in private or public practice. There you will apply the information, processes, and techniques of landscape architecture to design future landscape settings which are aesthetically pleasing and environmentally suited for implementation. Specifically, the program seeks to provide:

3.3.1. A working knowledge of the information, processes and techniques used in the landscape design and planning professions.

3.3.2. The capacity to verbally and graphically communicate with specialists in other arts and relevant social, natural and physical sciences.

3.3.3. An understanding of the cultural determinants of human behavior and the social, political, economic and legal institutions which influence land use and design decisions.

3.3.4. An understanding of the essential physical and ecological determinants which shape appropriate land use and design decisions.  

3.4. Graduate Program: Graduates of the program work in numerous capacities as environmental stewards and as guardians of our cultural landscape heritage; as avant-garde designers whose forms and spaces express the fundamental issues of our times; as private and public planners whose design perspective uniquely qualifies them to evaluate, interpret and create the policies which in turn shape our environmental framework; as private practitioners who imaginatively interpret and resolve environmental problems and as educators who continue to explore and teach an array of important subjects in colleges and universities throughout the world.

3.4.1. The Landscape Architecture Master's Program is designed to serve three groups of people. The first group of students are those who have discovered an interest in landscape architecture after earning a college degree. These people take a year of preparatory courses. Then they take an additional 48 credits toward their Master's degree, which is typically granted within a three year period. This professional degree is accredited by the American Society of Landscape Architects.

3.4.2. The second group of students are those who have earned a degree in a related field such as environmental design and architecture. These students can enter into the second year, but they often...

---

1 Information excerpted from LARP’s Website.
need to take several of the core requirements of the first year preparatory curriculum. These students usually take such required courses in lieu of the elective courses of the second and third year curricula.

3.4.3. The third group of students are those with a degree in landscape architecture, many from an accredited school in the U.S.A. These students enter the master's program to expand their knowledge in a special area of interest, and often work with a particular faculty member on a funded research project. 1

3.5. Long association with sciences, coming out of the Agriculture programs at UMass.

3.6. The primary learning environment is the design studio.

3.7. Degree programs include: Bachelors in Landscape Architecture and Environmental Design; Masters in Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning; Dual Masters in Landscape Architecture/Regional Planning; Doctorate in Regional Planning.

3.8. Their Stockbridge School also offers an Associate Degree in Landscape Contracting.

3.9. There is a great demand for landscape architects especially those with training related to the environment, climate change and sustainable design.

3.10. There tends to be a high contact time ratio between faculty with students, especially through studio work.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Assoc Professor U of M, 5; Asst Professor U of M, 2; Clerks 2; Departmental Assistant, 1; Graduate Research Assistant, 9; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 17; Head of Department, 1; Lecturer A, U of M, 2; Lecturer U of M, 4; Professor U of M, 3; Senior Lecturer II, 1; Student Employee, 9; Typist II, 1; Totaling 57. 2

4.2. Faculty: 14 active faculty with 2 open positions in Landscape Architecture & Regional planning.


4.4. Typically have 25 new student per year (3 year program).

4.5. Undergraduates: 30 Sophomores, 25 to 27 Juniors and Seniors

4.6. Landscape contracting has approximately 30 students per year (a 2 year program).

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. LARP occupies 26,029 nsf (22,007 sf in Hill House and 2,022 sf in Ag. Eng. North).

5.2. Hills floors 1 thru 4. Program space has been compressed by space lost to flooding in the basement. The basement was their largest single space.

5.3. Space is extremely congested during project charrette times at the end of the semester.

5.4. Space was inadequate even before the basement became usable.

5.5. Spaces are not well configured (shaped) for their needs. Room layouts are being forced to conform to the old dorm building floor plate.

5.6. Current space is very central (the Bee Hive) for students and faculty involved in other courses throughout the campus but return to the central studio, home space.

5.7. The first floor lounge is open for the whole program.

5.8. Their Regional Planning lounge (rm. 210) is in a converted shower room. Studio space is very cramped, especially for building models.

5.9. Spaces are assigned by floor, according to the student’s year (sophomore, junior, etc.) rather than a more open model that would stimulate learning among students at differing levels. This is a function of fitting the building and floor plate not pedagogy.

---

2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
5.10. Vertically oriented studios make for a situation where the same problems may be studied by students in different year levels without the benefit of interaction between experience levels.

5.11. The Procopio Room (105) is very heavily used for classes and presentations. Practice presentations are a very important part of the program. Classes stop so that all students can attend cross program presentations in Procopio. The space is too small to fit a full class however.

5.12. The adjacent Gallery space works with the presentation space for pin-up but is too small. As a gallery, it is not on a regular travel route where it might stimulate and invigorate students and faculty.

5.13. The Stockbridge School, Landscape Contracting program is in the Ag Engineering Building. The space was noted to be sub-standard with poor ventilation and generally not well suited to studio use.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)
   6.1. Many cross discipline studies.
   6.4. Extremely important to maintain existing ties with Natural Resources and Economics departments.
   6.5. Studio programs could complement with Architecture. Model making, laser cutter, shop space.
   6.6. Similar collaboration with applied sciences. Water use, climate change, (Holdsworth and Stockbridge) and other programs dealing with environmental issues and sustainability.
   6.7. Masters programs interact on sustainable development practices. (CPPA, SPH).

7. Current Relocations or Renovations
   7.1. They have discussed moving their computer operations to UMass Classroom 101. They need to renovate but would only do it if they had dedicated use of the room. Real facility with graphic software such as Adobe comes from working with it and gaining the shared experience of other students. Computers should be immediately adjacent to and used in direct conjunction with the studio space.
   7.2. Classroom use in Hasbrook, Thompson, Morrell (computer labs) and others. They would strongly prefer to teach in space more proximate to their studios.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
   8.1. The program does not fit well in Hills. The condition of Hills is also very poor.
   8.2. Maintain the association with NRE for research and interdisciplinary studies.
   8.3. Pulling together with Architecture has been under discussion for some time.
   8.4. Still coming to terms with moving to HFA. There had been previous discussions to pull Architecture into the College of Natural Resources and the Environment.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
   9.1. Need to change furniture to a combination computer stations and layout tables. The model is moving toward professional workstations with computers and layout space rather than large tilt-top drafting tables.
   9.2. Space for adjunct faculty to meet with students.
   9.3. Larger studio spaces are needed in a floor plate designed for the purpose.
   9.4. Need computer teaching spaces contiguous with studios. They are moving toward requiring students to have their own laptops. Students also have to own their own software. Teaching will change to a model of allowing students to listen to and watch a presentation while using their laptops. Developing more of a professional model and workplace environment.
   9.5. Primary space needs are for studio space rather than Labs. A need has been identified for 2 additional, 30 student studios.
9.6. Studio work and pin-up space needs immediately adjacent computer lab and lecture/classroom space for effective teaching and integration of technology into the design process. Besides their location, there are timing problems and issue with the need for classrooms in non-standard schedule blocks. They very much miss a seminar space on scale with the room lost in the basement.

9.7. Studio space use tends to be very fluid and activities change randomly. It is hard to factor how auxiliary spaces might be shared. A multi station/purpose room model might work. A computer room might be better set up as a break-out space rather than a secondary use in the studio.

9.8. No familiar academic model could be pointed to and perhaps the best comparable is looking more toward the professional office model.

9.9. A high profile, zero energy building would be an ideal statement and commitment to the values of the program.

9.10. Stand alone Faculty Research Rooms (program rooms) are needed. Must be outside of faculty private office and have storage space. Program space should be located and set up to stimulate initiatives and collaborations with other schools and departments.

10. Department and / or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. All initiatives have to do with sustainability, the environment & climate change.

10.2. Dual degree with Xiaman University in China. Students Get degrees from both institutions – primarily a summer program.

10.3. International exchange with the Czech Republic.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. More information needed.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. The Center for Economic Development (CED) is a research and community-oriented technical assistance center that is partially funded by the Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce. ¹

12.2. The Center for Rural Massachusetts (CRM) was established at the University of Massachusetts in 1985 because a new set of problems had arisen in the rural part of the state, driven by rapid economic growth in urban areas, a widespread belief that uncontrolled growth posed a major threat to natural and built rural environments, major changes in the rural economy, and concerns about the welfare of rural residents. ¹

12.3. The Citizen Planner Training Collaborative provides local planning and zoning officials with tools to make effective decisions regarding their community's current and future land use. ¹

12.4. Urban, suburban & rural ecology (greenways). Climate change.

12.5. Local & regional economics.

12.6. Phido Remediation (brown site restoration with micro organism) Frank ? – Hamburg (Germany) canal focus.
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Comments:  A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1.  Corrections and additions to the Meeting Minutes #1.

1.1.  No comments noted.

2.  Space & Personnel Review:

2.1.  Current Use square footage, location and condition

2.1.1.  Basement space in Hills House has been condemned and is not useable.

2.1.2.  Harlow Barn has been demolished.

2.2.  Population & Personnel List

2.2.1.  Tenure Faculty projection

2.2.1.1.  Spring ’09 = 11, Fall ’09 =11, 2014 = 17
2.2.1.1. 17 would get to the department’s immediate need. Several retirements have not been recovered plus 5 for growth.

2.2.2. 2 faculty searches have been frozen. Lecturers have increased to fill in for deficiency in faculty (6-7 per semester).

2.2.3. Population count = 1 chair, 11 professors, 6-7 lecturers.

2.2.4. Student population needs to be reviewed by Regional Planning vs. Landscape Architecture, graduate vs. undergraduate students.

2.2.5. Temporary Employee is an assistant, should be included in office classified count.

2.2.6. Landscape architecture = 3yr program, 60% student population, Regional Planning = 2yr, 40% student population.

2.2.7. 35 masters students, 15 doctoral students.

2.2.8. Department restructuring happening at this time may change personnel needs.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. Harlow Barn has been demolished and should not included in existing conditions. Was used for storage and studio lab space. Est. 1,200 sf needs to be accommodated in right-sizing.

2.3.2. Hills House basement space needs to be accommodated in right-sizing.

2.3.3. (5) Studios for 30 undergraduate students. Includes studios for Storckbridge and Environmental Design. One studio needs to be fit out with computer station and layout table.

2.3.4. (3) studios 20 for graduate students.

2.3.5. (1) MRP studio @ 30 students.

2.3.6. Each studio should have a break-out space that includes marker boards and conf. table. It will be used also as multi-purpose spaces and seminar space.

2.3.7. Will not need new lab for students. Can use university IT labs for current needs.

2.3.7.1. Each student has own laptop. Moving toward putting all software required on students computer.

2.3.8. Precopio space is tight.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. Enrollment is stable. Department is at capacity due to allowable space.

3.2. Regional Planning, 2 yr program, needs classroom space and shared drafting table space.

3.3. Department restructuring currently happening may effect department size. Information will be provided.

3.4. May need to include an Environmental Design studio for 50 students. Could be 25 shared drafting tables.
3.5. Need fume hood area.

3.6. Need presentation room.

3.7. Need gallery space (exhibition space).

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation
   5.1. Vote to happen tomorrow if LARP to be incorporated into HFA.

6. Outline next steps
   6.1. LARP to review personnel/population counts and provide corrections to BH team.
   6.2. LARP to review student counts for Landscape vs. Regional Planning graduate & undergraduate students.
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1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background Information

3.1. Under Graduate Degree Program: Contemporary political science examines social and political behavior and practices, the varied contexts in which they occur, and the ideas and ideals which motivate persons in public life. Departmental requirements seek to develop a critical perspective toward the structure and operation of political systems and the major philosophical questions presented by these systems, acquainting students with different substantive areas and exposing them to several different methods of analysis, such as historical, legal, institutional, theoretical, and empirical. The department encourages its majors to pursue a diverse course of study, concentrating in the discipline of political science, but including other social sciences, history, journalism and English. 1

3.2. The M.A. and Ph.D. programs are intended to prepare students for careers in research, in college or university teaching, or in public service. The department's view of the discipline of political science is eclectic, based on the assumption that the study of politics is not reducible to any single set of methodological premises through which certainty and comprehensiveness of knowledge can be established. Instead, the department attempts to maintain a broadly based overview of political science, using whatever theories and methods seem likely to provide appropriate responses to the central questions of politics. 1

3.3. M.A. and Ph.D. students are required to do course work in each of three major subdivisions of political science: political theory, American government and politics, and international relations and comparative government. A thesis or analogous evidence of research capacity is required of all M.A. candidates. Ph.D. candidates will be required to complete comprehensive examinations in two fields of concentration prior to undertaking the Ph.D. dissertation. Competency in foreign languages and/or qualitative and quantitative research techniques must be demonstrated by all MA and Ph.D. candidates. 1

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Adviser, 1; Administrative Analyst, 1; Assoc Professor U of M, 7; Asst Professor U of M, 11; Chrm.Of Department U of M, 1; Clerks, 2; Graduate Research Assistant, 4; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 22; Graduate Teaching Associate, 1; Intern, 1; Lecturer U of M, 4; Professor U of M, 10; Student Employee, 11; Totaling 76. 2

4.2. 31 Full time faculty including 2 full time lecturers.

4.3. 15 new faculty have been hired in the past two years.

4.4. The salaries from loses in senior faculty have been reinvested to get more young, new hires to grow the number of faculty.

4.5. There are 724 degree students.

4.6. The Department has unrestricted enrollment. Interest remains strong in Political Science and further growth is anticipated.

4.7. The department primarily uses both extremes in classroom sizes, large lecture halls and small session seminar rooms.

1 Information excerpted from Political Science Website.
2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
4.8. Approximately 3000 students are enrolled in Political Science courses, including those taking Political Science general ed courses.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Department space occupies 8,163 nsf, all in the Thompson Tower.

5.2. Department space occupies all of the 2nd and 3rd floor of Thompson and about half of the 4th floor. They also have a large seminar office and 2 office spaces on the 5th floor with 2 small offices in the basement of Thompson Low-rise. The college has been moving other departments out of the 4th and 5th floors as they can, to make more room for Political Science.

5.3. The tight corridor and office spaces of Thompson restrict interaction between faculty, administrators and students.

5.4. Room 219 (recently renovated) has made a very successful student gathering space.

5.5. Rooms 228 & 230 have become a graduate student lounge.

5.6. Room 321 (green room) is about to come on line as a lounge space.

5.7. Room 322 is the mail room for the whole department.

5.8. Room 512 has become a department controlled space for Political Science. It had been a UMass classroom.

5.9. Room 620 (the large open space) is currently CPPA but will be reassigned as UMass space.

5.10. Classrooms are used in Machmer, Tobin and Thompson lecture halls with one session in Mahar.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. Important collaborations exist with the Center for Public Policy and Administration, Sociology, Commonwealth College, Resource Economics, etc. The department is very interdisciplinary, however and encourages students to pursue diverse and complimentary programs.

6.2. Building up collaborations with Science and Technology programs also are evolving goals.

6.3. There are some faculty complaints about the travel distance to Lederle and Hills House but the central location works well in general.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. There have been and are several on-going small renovation projects in Thompson.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. The College has a goal to move Sociology to a central location in Machmer (where they are partially located now) taking them out of the space in Thompson for Political Science. Communications would have to relocate out of Machmer to make this possible.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. Space is needed for visiting faculty.

9.2. Meeting space is also needed for faculty and lecturers.

9.3. A small lunch room would be a good way to strengthen faculty associations and collaborations.

9.4. When asked for examples of good quality facilities in other programs, Duke and Stanford were noted.

9.5. Rooms are needed for small honors student group session. Commonwealth College sessions are 1 hour and give students a 4 credit course but this is a non-standard block which cannot be accommodated in the standard UMass room schedule. Thompson 512 is currently used.
9.6. There is a big shortage of conference, seminar and general meeting space. The scale of the space needed could be an unassigned work space or larger office.

9.7. The large size of the Department probably requires a variety of office environments to meet various personal preferences for privacy or more open office spaces with spontaneous interaction.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. The Department has hired more cross-discipline faculty in recent years.

10.2. More honors programs are being offered with faculty being asked to do 1 hour special colloquiaums. Faculty members volunteer to hold small group meetings of 10 students.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. Need to advance new programs into East Asian studies, China, etc.

11.2. The department is moving toward capping upper level classes (series 300) to 25 students, down from 40 in the past. Entry level classes have become commensurately larger. The change has had a positive impact on the program allowing more faculty interaction and writing projects.

11.3. Lecture courses have expanded from what were 200 seat classes to 300 and even 450. TAs have seminar session of 25 students each. The pedagogy does not change much between150 to 300 seat instruction.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. Social Science research tends to need more gathering and meeting space for collaboration and discussion than other types of research would.
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Political Science- John Hird Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg
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Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the Meeting Minutes #1.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

   2.1.1. Some updates that are currently being made to the Horizon Data that are not reflected in this report. Current Use space counts will be affected. When the updated Horizon File is made available, Burthill will incorporate it into the report.

   2.1.2. The current department chair moves from their faculty office into the Dept. Chair office for the duration of their term. A dedicated Dept Chair office in addition to the current chair’s faculty office would better suit department needs.

   2.1.3. Undergraduate and graduate advisors use their faculty office for those functions. Ideally a second office would be used.

   2.1.4. 2 full time lecturers have private offices. 4 lecturers share 2 office spaces.
2.1.5. Usually have 2 visiting faculty.

2.1.6. Usually have 3 adjunct professors that need meeting space. Typically are not given space since they have office space somewhere else. A shared office space will be added @ 50sf/station for this use.

2.1.7. Use 2 office spaces (#228, 230) as a grad student lounge @ 273sf. Undergraduate lounge is #219.

2.1.8. Rm 620 is thought to be reverting to a UMass classroom.

2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.2.1. Personnel count looks correct; update visiting professors and lecturers.

2.2.2. This summer will be adding 1 classified staff member at part time employment. Currently classified staff is in a temporary office.

2.2.3. Sometimes do have more than 28 graduate student employees. Currently house them as 3 stations per office.

2.2.4. Typically have 2-3 student employees.

2.2.5. Undergraduates count at 768 students. Trend has been increasing over the years.

2.2.6. June ’09 = 29 tenure faculty, Sept. ’09 – 29, 2014 @ 35 tenure faculty.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. Report shows department is currently undersized. Updated Horizon Data should reconcile this.

2.3.2. Changes will be made to seminar and conference room. Conference Rooms for 35 and seminar space for 25 will be reflected in report.

2.3.3. Proposed lounge space is too small. Space @ 200-300sf may better suit dept. needs.

2.3.4. Will review file storage to 500sf.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. Student numbers have been increasing as well as faculty numbers.

3.2. Need instructional space for 20 students. Have undergraduate classes up to 25 students. Scheduling classroom space is difficult. Have a great need for classrooms for 15-25 students. Sometimes use #620 as classroom space.

3.3. Conference room should fit faculty and lecturers.

3.4. The department needs identity/reception space.

3.5. Need computer lab @ 150sf.

3.6. Need undergraduate lounge space. Currently has room 219 @325sf that has computer and lounge space. Is really a waiting area or call an advising area.

4. Review Location Considerations: 
4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)
4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

5.1. Thompson is not a great facility for the department. Does not encourage interactment between students and faculty. Corridors are small and department is tight.

6. Outline next steps

6.1. F&CP will provide updated Horizon data for BH to incorporate in department reports.
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1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. We are a generalist sociology department with a wide variety of research interests. Recent books and articles by faculty members have addressed the creation of global capitalist markets, comparative adolescent sexuality, Viagra, democratization, the revival of the labor movement, workplace discrimination, grammars of death, white collar criminal conspiracies, comparative family policy, comparative racial inequality, the socialization of Chinese adopted children, Latin American social movements, women's workforce and men's household labor participation, and many other topics. ¹

3.2. The graduate program is loosely organized around a series of intellectual clusters that reflect ongoing faculty research interests. These include Culture and Identity; Crime, Law and Deviance; Gender, Sexuality and Family; Politics, Movements and Globalization; Race, Immigration and Citizenship; Social Demography; Social Networks; Work, Organization and Economy. The undergraduate program is one of the most popular on campus. Both programs are undergoing significant curriculum enhancements this year. The department is at once committed to excellent education, basic research and to be a leader in the project of public sociology. ¹

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Administrative Analysts 2, Assoc Dean, Coll Social & Beh Sci 1, Assoc Professor U of M 3, Asst Professor U of M 11, Chairman of Department A 1, Clerk 1, Clerk IV 1, Graduate Project Assistant 1, Graduate Research Assistant 7, Graduate Teaching Assistants 21, Graduate Teaching Associate 10, Lecturer U of M 11, Professor U of M 7, Student Employee 7, Technical Specialist U of M 1, Typist 1, Visiting Assistant Professor 1; totaling 78. ²

4.2. Faculty & Staff: 4 Professors; 1 Professors Emeritus; 5 Associate Professors; 8 Assistant Professors; 2 Distinguished Professors; 3 Lecturers; 6 Research Center Managers & Assistants; 2 Senior Research Fellow; and, 2 Administrative Assistants (shared with SDPPSA) = 33 total

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Sociology occupies 12,309 nsf split between Thompson (7,063 sf) and Machmer (5,246 sf).

5.2. The Thompson space is on floors 5 thru 7 with the Chairs office in room 714. Thompson is “socially stifling” due to its layout and tight spaces. The Machmer space is the entire 3rd floor of the west wing.

5.3. The Social and Demographic Research Institute (SADRI) is on the 3rd floor of Machmer.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. None noted.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. Subdividing spaces at the north end of Machmer West.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. The Long term plan would move Sociology into Machmer.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. Sociology needs to be all in one space. They like Machmer if it were upgraded.

¹ Information excerpted from Sociology’s Website.
² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records
9.2. The Social and Demographic Research Institute (SADRI) is housed within the Machmer space. They need program room(s) for their research teams.

9.3. Focus group rooms: Similar in characteristics to a conference room with natural light, but with video and audio taping equipment, two way mirror and observation area (even if they are using video). Human subject research group of 10 to 12 participants. This type of space could be shared by another department such as psychology. The room would have specialty installations for specific research projects that would limit its availability at times. The room would be heavily used by both Grad and undergrad students.

9.4. Need for a Social Science Research facility – a hub for research identity which should be central to the department.

9.5. Survey research center (call center) including changing to computer based system supervisor’s office, 4 to 6 work stations with padded, acoustic separated walls.

9.6. Computer labs staffed by Senior Graduate Students & a technical specialist for research. 20 to 30 seats and an instructor’s work station. Classroom set up similar to grad student room on the 7th floor of Thompson. The computer room needs to be adjacent to the research center.

9.7. Chapel Hill has a very well established research facility, using graduate students with statistical background and graduate students as research assistant. The center should be dedicated to Social Science.

9.8. Faculty input provided 3/27/09

9.8.1. Having (the whole department) together, preferably in a long hall configuration (eg Machmer, entire third floor, if renovated and all asbestos removed, windows fixed or replaced, real air conditioning and consistent heat). It was pointed out that not only are our faculty spatially fragmented, but so are faculty and their RAs/TAs under the current two building, four floor model.

9.8.2. Nice seminar/meeting rooms for graduate classes and project meetings. These might be put in SADRI as more general social science project resource.

9.8.3. A nice conference space, probably on the scale of Machmer W32, but less classroom like, for whole department meetings and seminars.

9.8.4. A small room, preferably with windows, in SADRI to house computers with sensitive data on them. This is important, as many social science data sets come with security requirements, that can be (imperfectly) met in faculty offices, but then preclude group projects.

9.8.5. A lounge space with sink/water facilities, lunch room, etc. If it was large enough to contain a pool table, hold receptions, dances, etc. that would be really nice.

9.8.6. If SADRI was reconfigured as a general social science research center, it will need to have a separate space of this type.

9.8.7. A small quiet room for staff lunches. ³

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. The department has research clusters in work organizations, race & immigration, gender & sexuality, criminology and social networks.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. The department has general education BA and PhD programs offering over 100 courses to more than 8,000 students a year.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. Current research is primarily done on computers in private offices partly because of the lack of other program space.

³ Information excerpted from Department information distributed at the meeting.
12.2. SADRI is not entirely under Sociology but has some other SBS relationships as it has become an institute. They are helping with grant proposal writing and grant management to Department of Health. They would like to see this evolve into a major research center. Not necessarily at the center of the department but tied to and in central proximity to the other related facilities.

12.3. A focus room could be contracted out and resourced as revenue generator.

12.4. Focus room for SADRI should be larger.
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Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2  
Meeting Date: 5/21/09 3:00  
Project Phase: Information Gathering  
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:  
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:  
Sociology- Don Tomaskovic-Devey  
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova  
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris

Distribution:  
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to the Meeting Minutes #1.
   1.1. Revisions were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
      2.1.1. The offices in Machmer Hall are large in comparison to other university office. Often the department uses them as private offices.
      2.1.2. The department uses Machmer #W32 as a 600sf conference room. The other conference room is quite small at the size of an office.
      2.1.3. In both Thompson and Machmer areas labeled as storage space is really used as office or lounge space.
      2.1.4. Updates to the Horizon Data file are to be made that reflect the department’s current use of space.
      2.1.5. Study = work study and admin student area. Correct space type.
2.2. Population & Personnel List

2.2.1. Faculty & staff counts were reviewed and looks correct. There will be 44 graduate employees starting at the end of May.

2.2.1.1. Faculty tenure lines

2.2.1.1.1. Spring ‘09 = 23, Fall ‘09 = 25, 2014 = 27

2.2.1.2. The Labor Center (2 professional, 3 faculty) may become a part of the Sociology Department.

2.2.2. It is estimated that there are about 500 undergraduate students now.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison.

2.3.1. File Storage for the department could just be at150sf. Need storage for files and office supplies.

2.3.2. The Social and Demographic Research Institute (SADRI) is currently just file storage space.

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs

3.1. The department could use a conference room for 33 people.

3.2. Computer lab for 25 stations (@ 40sf/station) would be used by the department and SADRI.

3.3. Sociology conducts focus groups and surveys; dedicated spaces for these uses is needed.

3.4. A dedicated department seminar room is needed.

4. Review Location Considerations:

4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings)

4.1.1. Sociology is split between Machmer Hall and Thompson Hall. Ideally the department would be together on one floor of a building (renovated Machmer).

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources.

4.2.1. Sociology has connections to Political Science, Economics, Afro-American studies, Women’s studies, and computer science.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation

6. Outline next steps

6.1. Updated Horizon Data is to be provided to BH by UMass F&CP. Current use spaces will be revised.

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.
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BURT HILL

/s/
Carol Harris
May 21, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg

Subject/Project Number: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Dean’s Offices

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1  Meeting Date: 4/7/09 2:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering ST02
Meeting Location: Draper Hall Rm 227

Meeting Purpose:
Dean’s Offices, Space Use

Attendees: Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
SBS, Karen Schoenberger – Assistant Dean
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences at UMass Amherst is home to departments and programs leading to the Bachelor of Arts: Anthropology, Communication, Economics, Journalism, Legal Studies, Political Science, Psychology, Social Thought and Political Economy, and Sociology. The Psychology Department also offers a program leading to the Bachelor of Science. In addition, numerous departments, programs and centers within the College offer graduate degrees and certificates.¹

3.2. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences focuses on behavior and organization from cultural, social, psychological, and biological perspectives. Undergraduates achieve an understanding of culture, society, individual and social interaction processes, as well as methodology. Students anchor their knowledge in at least one discipline, but are encouraged to expand their understanding through various enriching experiences inside and outside the classroom. ¹

3.3. Graduates of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences have strong analytic and problem-solving abilities, good human relations skills, and confidence in their ability to learn and grow in new work situations. Careers include law, social work, economics, financial analysis, urban and regional planning, education, management, medicine, international relations, journalism, public relations, television and radio broadcasting, advertising, and more. ¹

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Administrative Analyst, 1; Administrative Supervisor, 1; Assistant Dean, 1; Assoc Dean, 1; Clerks 3; Dean, 1; Graduate Teaching Assistants, 2; Lecturer A, U of M, 2; Senior Development Officer, 1; Sr Editor/Writer, 1; Student Employee, 6; Totaling 20. ²

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. The Dean’s office suite occupies 7,995 nsf. The main office suite is on the second floor of Draper Hall (2,717 sf), with an advising office in Machmer (289 sf) and offices and computer lab space in Thompson Hall (4,989 sf).

5.2. The Draper space is the appropriate size, including storage space and is well lit and pleasant. It is not, however, accessible at any level and lacks air conditioning and adequate ventilation.

5.3. Room 201 a & b is very tight due to inclusion of personnel files in the office space.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. Draper is somewhat removed from the Department offices which are concentrated in Thompson, Tobin and Machmer.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. The advising center in Machmer is planned to move to Thompson. This would be contingent on the Linux lab may being moved out of the base of Thompson and a chain of other small moves.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

¹ Information excerpted from SBS Website.
² Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records
9.1. Not discussed

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives
   10.1. Not discussed
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From: Carol Harris

December 10, 2009

Subject/Project Number: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/8/09
9:30
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:
SBS Dean- Karen Schoenberg
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments:
A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:
3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
      4.1.1. The distance to Draper from Thompson is not that problematic. Draper has some vacant space.
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:
5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:
6. **Outline next steps:**

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

**BURT HILL**

/s/

Joel E. Nordberg

May 4, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Carol Harris

December 16, 2009

Subject/Project Number: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 3
Meeting Date: 7/27/09
Meeting Location: Information Gathering
Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
SBS, Assist. Dean- Karen Schoenberger
SBS, Assoc. Dean- Robert Feldman
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova, Pam Rooney
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. SBS Dean
   1.1. SBS Advising
       1.1.1. Will be using the 1st floor of Thompson for advising.
       1.1.2. As of Sept. 1, will be 2 to 5 advising staff, receptionist, Pre Law staff person, larger number of peer advisors (5 stations for peer advisors – not paid positions, credited).
   1.2. Machmer W13 will become the LINUX Lab (from HR).
   1.3. SBS tries to provide full time lecturers private offices.
   1.4. Center Directors should get a second/dedicated office for their program.
   1.5. Dean’s office storage- 4 departments have space in Thompson basement (2022 is not fully utilized).

1.6. CPPA
   1.6.1. Small center that is very successful and has potential to grow.
   1.6.2. Currently thinking about spaces in Gordon Hall, but no commitments made. But, Gordon should not be taken into account for their long term plans (department need to pay for space in Gordon Hall).
   1.6.3. Affiliations with PERI (a center for policy related research).

1.7. Labor Center
   1.7.1. Lost 2 employees
   1.7.2. Potentially consolidating the program with Sociology.
1.8. Legal Studies
   1.8.1. Program is “in-flux”.
   1.8.2. Journal space needed @ 450sf.
   1.8.3. Not a Pre-Law advising group.
   1.8.4. Has too much space now.

1.9. STPEC

2. Anthropology
   2.1. NCL service should be tied to the number of labs and not the existing count. The labs have a large storage need (+/- 150 sf each).
   2.2. The department is fragmented and has some horrible spaces. Asbestos is present in some areas.
   2.3. Special needs includes artifact storage.
   2.4. Is a very diversified program and has ties to the sciences, humanities and other SBS departments.
   2.5. Fernald as a potential relocation building, could be good location by its proximity to the science.
   2.6. Hopes for a museum at some point (there is a need for one).
   2.7. The existing facilities deter potential graduate students and faculty.
   2.8. Cultural Anthropology needs research space.

3. Communications/Journalism
   3.1. An up-and-coming/showcase program.
   3.2. The South College spaces (3 rooms, 115, 117, 12) are off line.
   3.3. The Photo Lab (16mm film lab) is self supporting. The SBS/Comm-Jour inventory gets poached by outsiders.
   3.4. Screening Room is a big need. Longer scheduling time need. Could be shared with the University.
   3.5. Right Size studio/production space (2 for growth).
   3.6. Good synergy with Film Studies need.

4. Economics
   4.1. Stable program; not anticipating much growth.

5. Sociology
   5.1. Large program; ripe for growth.

6. Political Science
   6.1. Successful program; ripe for growth.
   6.2. Graduate students will take over advising space in Machmer.
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From: Joel E. Nordberg

April 21, 2009

Subject/Project Number: Commonwealth College

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1
Meeting Date: 3/31/09
1:30 – 3:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering
Meeting Location: Goodell ST02

Meeting Purpose: Commonwealth College, Space Use

Attendees: CC, Pirsilla Clarkson, – Dean
CC, Meredith Lind – Director of Academic Programs
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova, Susan Personette
DCAM, Ann Storer
Burt Hill, Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution: Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Alex Wing, Michael Reagan

1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
      1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
      1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
      1.3.3. Department location plans.
      1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
      1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
      2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. As noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. 10th anniversary of Commonwealth College becoming a College. The initiative started in 1967 within the College of Arts and Sciences and became an identified Program in the early 1970s.

3.2. Commonwealth College implies an Honors College for the entire state/Commonwealth, not just within the UMass Amherst.

3.3. Commonwealth College, the honors college at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, was established to offer academically talented students a community that promotes engagement with peers, leading scholars, and society. ¹

3.4. We are here to enhance undergraduate education for Commonwealth College students using the resources of a large, public research university and to offer students an academic community that promotes engagement with society, with leading scholars, and with their peers. ¹

3.5. The ecology of the university depends on a deep and abiding understanding that inquiry, investigation, and discovery are the heart of the enterprise, whether in funded research projects or in undergraduate classrooms or graduate apprenticeships. Everyone at a university should be a discoverer, a learner. That shared mission binds together all that happens on a campus. The teaching responsibility of the university is to make all its students participants in the mission. Those students must undergird their engagement in research with the strong “general” education that creates a unity with their peers, their professors, and the rest of society. (The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America’s Research Universities). ¹

Commonwealth College works to provide its students a foundation for successful lifelong learning. The curriculum emphasizes inquiry and critical analysis, independent research, collaborative work, engagement with society, and effective communication skills. The College strives to nurture its students’ love of learning and to develop their ability to critically assess problems. The College encourages discovery, creativity, initiative, responsibility, collaboration, leadership, and independent thought. These are the attributes that enhance opportunities for individuals, organizations, and society as a whole. ¹

In step with the land grant mission of the University, Commonwealth College promotes meaningful engagement with society. The College works with the University and surrounding community to afford its students academically based opportunities such as internships, co-ops, experiential learning courses, leadership training, and community service learning courses (courses that integrate work in the classroom with active outreach to the community in order to meet community needs). The college also promotes student leadership through specific leadership courses, through its speaker series and alumni mentoring/shadowing programs, and by encouraging student participation in college activities such as peer mentoring, committee work, and events planning. ¹

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Academic Advisers 4; Academic Advisor/Program Coord, 1; Academic Program Coords, 3; Academic Program Director, 1; Administrative Analyst, 1; Clerical Assistant, 1; Clerks, 8; Dean, Commonwealth College, 1; Departmental Assistant, 1; Dir Of Advising/Outreach, 1; Graduate Project Assistant, 8; Graduate Research Assistant, 1; Graduate

¹ Information excerpted from Commonwealth College Website.
4.2. Faculty & Staff: There are no tenure track faculty lecturers. There are 10 total full time lecturers, 8 hired last year in addition to 2 they had. 2 Executive staff who also teach. One cross over lecturer shared with another department. Roughly 40 part time lecturers who teach one or two classes per year.

4.3. There are approximately 3500 Students in the honors college. Students can either be invited as freshman at the time of acceptance with AP weighted, four year, 4.0 GPA average and SAT scores of 1,300 or higher. Freshman can also apply with a GPA of 3.9. Interdisciplinary seminars are offered in addition to regular course instruction. 600 new students are targeted for invitation for the fall of 09. Enrolled university students can also apply during their academic careers.

4.4. Approximately 11,000 credit hours are taken per year, 7,000 of which are Gen-ed credits.

4.5. More engineering major students are coming into Commonwealth College, recently surpassing the number of School of Management students.

4.6. Bachelor Degree in Individual Concentration (BDIC) has about 400 students. These students design their own major.

4.7. Most degrees are double majors in additions to the Honors distinction.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions


5.2. 406A is their only classroom/multi purpose room.

5.3. Office space is too open and uncontrolled. The front office is not staffed in off hours creating a situation where file drawers must be locked as student record files are in the open office environment.

5.4. The open office is inappropriate for student counseling but there is not private space available.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. The current central location on campus is good as their students are dispersed throughout the colleges.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. Dickinson might be a good fit.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. They would like to control 8 Classrooms of 25 seat maximum, based on their current 3,500 students. More if the program were to grow.

9.2. Part time lecturers need private space to meet with students. They could be shared offices.

9.3. Their rooms need flexible seating such as 406A were tables can be rearranging into small discussion groups.

9.4. They currently are in an open office environment which is inappropriate for private meetings and counseling.

9.5. The need display space for student work.

9.6. Performance space for student projects. They have used space off campus at the Masonic Lodge (Studio 204) which turned problematic due to some damage to the space.

2 Information excerpted from UMass provided HR records.
10. **Department and /or Faculty Initiatives**

10.1. Classroom space is needed to improve and advance the program. The scholastic camaraderie is very limited by the space. Classrooms should be adjacent to the advising spaces.

10.2. Their pedagogy does not fit with standard schedule blocks. Courses are often taught like Graduate Seminar classes with increased credit for additional seminar work.

10.3. They hold a special focus each night of the week. Monday - Pizza & Prof night; Tuesday - Film night; Wednesday - Resume’ and career how-to sessions, etc.

10.4. Community Service work guidance – advising on how to bring their class work into public service.

11. **Department Instructional Program**

11.1. 20 percent of honors students course work must be done in Honors Programs.


11.3. Pedagogy is shaped by the space and limited by the program schedule which is not always appropriate to the need.

12. **Department Research Program**

12.1. Emphasis on undergraduate research.

12.2. Faculty is engaged in a wide spectrum of programs on campus. Dean Clarkson is working with 15 research students in Kinesiology at Totman.

12.3. They are pursuing 2 NIH research grants.
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Subject/Project Number: Office of the Provost
Bachelor's Degree with Individual Concentration

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number:  Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
1 5/8/09 Information Gathering Goodell
  1:30 ST02 Rm 608

Meeting Purpose:
Bachelor’s Degree with Individual Concentration (BDIC), Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:
BDIC, Daniel Gordon - Director Ann Storer, Ludmilla
BDIC, Linda Roney - Coordinator Pavlova, Alex Wing,
UMass F&CP, Ludmilla Pavlova Michael Reagan
DCAM , Ann Storer
Burt Hill , Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
      1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
      1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
      1.3.3. Department location plans.
      1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
      1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Bachelor’s Degree with Individual Concentration (BDIC) is a unique program at the University of Massachusetts that offers highly motivated and self-directed students the opportunity to design their own majors. As an alternative to traditional majors, the BDIC Program allows students to pursue their educational goals in areas not available within an existing department curriculum on campus. Students, with the help of a faculty sponsor, articulate their major and select courses on the basis of a unifying theme called an area of concentration. Students may earn either a bachelor’s of science or a bachelor’s of arts degree, depending upon the curriculum they choose.

The area of study for a BDIC concentration must be interdisciplinary, drawing from at least three fields or disciplines, and it may not duplicate an existing major. Courses may be chosen from any of the departments within the University, and from the other campuses in the Five College Consortium. Internship and independent study work is encouraged, as well as international and domestic exchange. ¹

3.2. The program began in 1970 and serves 3 basic needs: 1) Allows students with multiple interests and strengths in multiple fields to explore these interest without the exclusion of a specialized major; 2) Gives students who do not perform well by GPA standards an avenue to develop interests outside of traditional course work study; 3) Provides an alternative track for students who do not get into their school of choice.

3.3. Students need a minimum of 30 credits to be accepted into the program. All students take a proposal writing course to generate their independent concentration program. The BDIC degree can be completed in 4 semesters.

3.4. BDIC came under Commonwealth College about a year ago.

3.5. BDIC has a large appeal to out of state students.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. Students: 300 majors with 110 in the current proposal class preparing for next semester.

4.2. Faculty & Staff: 1 Director (part time but with office in BDIC, 2 fulltime staff, the Coordinator and the Office Manager; 6 faculty from other departments who provide advising to students on a two hours per week basis, 1 Graduate Student who runs the Jr. Writing Program and provides 5 hrs/week advising; 7 student employees/peer advisors; and, 3 student employees/receptionists = 20 total. ²

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. BDIC occupies 1,356 nsf on the 6th floor of Goodell Hall.

5.2. The space is in one, large open plan office with office partition subdivisions to delineate private offices from the central meeting and multi-purpose area.

5.3. They like the energy of the open plan office and central meeting space.

5.4. They hold small speaking events and receptions in their central multi-purpose space which also includes a small soft seating lounge area, a small conference table, coffee machine and snack area.

¹ Information excerpted from Department information distributed at the meeting.
² Information gathered at the meeting.
5.5. The program is heavily advising based with both faculty and student peer advisors meeting with students one on one in the central office space and in the director’s office and the other work stations. Each student meets with the director at least once per semester at pre-registration. In general the open environment works for their needs.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. The program is advising intensive with students doing course work in many areas of the campus. The central location of Goodell is a plus.

6.2. They work closely with Commonwealth College and Undergraduate Advising who are also in Goodell. Their Academic Dean is in UA as well.

6.3. They also have a strong commitment to building relationships between the Humanities and Sciences and could, perhaps, be geographically closer to science and engineering programs.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. None noted

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. Access to a seminar room for planning meetings of approximately 12 persons.

9.2. Students sometimes do a performance senior project similar to a Commonwealth College Capstone. Using theater space has not worked out in the past.

9.3. More computer stations for student use.

9.4. There are occasions when private office space is needed.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. It is hoped that the program could expand its faculty to include 4 dedicated faculty positions.

10.2. Building up ties to alumni for student advising and fundraising.

10.3. They also would like to strengthen ties to music.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. BDIC 396P is their proposal writing course which they teach. The class has grown to 110 students this year.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. None noted.
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Meeting Purpose:
International Programs Office, Space Use

Attendees: Distribution:
IPO, Sherry Bohonowicz, Office Manag., Assist. to the Dir. IPO, Pat Vokbus, Dean of Exchange Students
IPO, Ericka Schluntz, Director of Education Abroad IPO, Nancy Condon, International Scholar Advisor
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1. Purpose
1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
   1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
   1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
   1.3.3. Department location plans.
   1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
   1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Established in 1968, the International Programs Office (IPO) is a comprehensive office that works with incoming international students and scholars, as well as managing the study abroad and exchange programs and processes for all students, faculty and staff.

Welcoming over 2,000 international students and scholars and sending over 1,000 students to study abroad each year, IPO provides services to all who seek a rich international, intercultural experience. The staff works closely with faculty and administrators throughout the campus. 1

3.2. The functions of International Programs Office (IPO) at a glance:
- To advise UMass students about study-abroad options, to send them abroad, and to support them while they are abroad;
- To advise and inform international applicants about federal policy, to bring international students to study at UMass, and to support them while they are here;
- To provide orientation and various informational sessions for incoming international students as well as for outgoing UMass students;
- To bring international scholars and faculty to campus and to support them while they are part of the UMass & 5 College community;
- To work with the Graduate School, the Admissions Office, faculty, the administration, UMass systems offices and staff to facilitate and carry out the functions above;
- To welcome and host international visitors and other dignitaries to campus, and;
- To act as a resource for the campus (and for the UMass system) on academic international linkages. 2

3.3. IPO started as the W.S. Clark International Center in the W.S. Clark Building. That building burned and the program moved to the Goodell Building but was fragmented in other temporary locations on campus. The program moved to Hills House in the mid 90s.

3.3.1. A historical note in this context: IPO had its own building very briefly, the William S Clark International Center, which burnt down in spring of 1991. After the fire, the offices were moved temporarily to Goodell, then to Hills South, where there is currently not enough space for IPO’s various responsibilities. 2

3.4. The program offers a range of services including: advising on credit transfer; financial aid carry-over, assistance to visiting students and scholars employed while in the US; preparing students to go abroad and debriefing returning students; support in language development, etc.

3.5. The type of work they do involves both: 1on1 interviews, requiring privacy which is inadequate at present for numerous physical layout reasons, leading to conversations that are held in inappropriate settings; and large gatherings for instruction, hospitality and various types of meetings.

3.6. Each year IPO hosts, or helps to host, dozens of visitors both from the US and from around the world. 2

3.7. IPO is a twelve-month office with all permanent staff working on a year-round basis. 2

1 Information excerpted from the International Programs Office Website.
2 Information excerpted from Department information distributed at the meeting.
4. **Department Headcount (Population)**
   
   4.1. IPO serves approximately 4,500 – 5,000 students, researchers, and scholars annually.  
   
   4.2. Currently there are approximately 1,200 UMass students studying aboard and 1,600 visiting foreign students and scholars.  
   
   4.3. The program lost almost 1/3rd of its staff primarily to retirement in 2002 and has not been able to build back to where it was. They are very stretched to meet the student demand with their current staff level.  
   
   4.4. A breakdown of current staffing is as follows: 1 Director of IPO; 1 Education Abroad Director; 12 professional staff; 4 clerks/bookkeepers; 4 graduate students; and, 19 student workers.  
   
   4.5. They need 3 new professional staff positions but are unable to hire them.  
   
   4.6. The demand for study abroad opportunities is growing. The university also has a commitment to bring more international students into the University which translates to the need for more staff, offices and space.  
   
   4.7. Most incoming foreign students are entering graduate level programs.  

5. **Current Location and Space Conditions**
   
   5.1. IPO occupies 4,370 nsf, all in the 4th floor of Hills House South.  
   
   5.2. A more center-campus location would be welcome as would space that reinforces the identity of the program.  
   
   5.3. The current space in Hills includes: 17 offices (most with one person, several with two or three); 1 workroom/copy room; 1 advising center; 1 main office/receptionist area; and, 1 storage room (in a converted shower room).  
   
   5.4. The offices are completely full and space is lacking for a number of key personnel, activities and functions.  
   
   5.5. There is no available office space for visiting scholars or faculty and no rooms for meetings or orientation sessions.  
   
   5.6. They are forced to use multi-person offices, which is unacceptable as it compromises confidentiality (issues such as discussions of GPA, medical and behavioral histories, etc.).  
   
   5.7. Examples of known good peer facilities include Yale and the University of Indiana.  
   
   5.8. They house an internal registrar to coordinate credit transfers for students in their and host programs.  
   
   5.9. There is no room for meetings or orientation sessions.  

6. **Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)**
   
   6.1. They have interactions with students in all Colleges and Departments. Exchanges with Engineering and professional scholars were mentioned.  
   
   6.2. They work closely with the Graduate Schools with incoming students.  
   
   6.3. IPO also needs to be in close contact with Undergraduate Admissions, the Registrar; and, financial aid and other campus administrative offices. Goodell and Whitmore are important contact points for financial connections and scholarship guidance.  
   
   6.4. They occasionally use the Translation Center but only when they have to translate sensitive documents.  

7. **Current Relocations or Renovations**
   
   7.1. They have tried to negotiate with the School of Ed. to get more space on the 4th floor as their use of the offices in the south wing, 4th floor, seems light. But this has not worked out.  

8. **Proposed Relocations or Renovations**
   
   8.1. If funding can be found, the ideal solution would be a separate “International Building” on campus to be used for all of the functions described above as well as to provide accommodations and work space for visiting
international scholars. 2 This set up was felt to work well in the past, see referenced historical note 3.3.1 (although there was no rooms to accommodate visitors).

8.2. All discussion about moving to date have been contingent on available funding.

8.3. A central campus location would better suit their need.

8.4. They see great benefit to the Program in having a more visible presence and an identity of their building. The Chapel, West Experiment station were thrown out in discussion.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. They would like the identity of their own building and would be receptive to a renovated older building.

9.2. They have a high need for gathering space for student and faculty and event rooms. They sponsor numerous receptions and often have been bumped by academic needs for space.

9.3. An advising center, set up for the purpose, is needed for incoming and outgoing student meetings and interviews.

9.4. Storage space. They must maintain study abroad student records indefinitely for students that may not have graduated. Records are in boxes but should be in drawers or high density storage in a file room.

9.5. All professional staff and advisors need a private office.

9.6. They get limited use of the UMass classroom on their floor where they run a very successful outreach, summer exchange program. Departing students can leave their small appliances, bikes, furniture, etc. for students coming in. The classroom does not fit the need well however as it does not become available early enough and they have had to move out before new students/faculty arrive in the late summer to allow for cleaning. They could use an exchange space like this year round.

9.7. In order to fulfill its numerous responsibilities effectively, IPO needs:
   - Administrative space at a central location on campus;
   - 10,000 sq. ft. of space (ideally 15,000 sq. ft.);
   - Offices for all advisors, the associate Provost, the Director of Education Abroad, the Budget Manager (NOTE: for reasons of confidentiality cubicles are not an option);
   - Advising Center for Education Abroad;
   - Conference room for meetings, orientations;
   - Storage (secure) for important academic and financial records and visa documents, etc.;
   - Kitchen facility for hosting international events and study abroad (gatherings). 2

9.8. Students who have been abroad serve as peer counselors. They do not need dedicated offices but available spaces where private interview can be held in confidence are needed.

9.9. They need to stay together. When the offices were temporarily relocated after the fire, groups were split up causing a lot of inefficiency and loss of identity. With the potential for Hills to be taken off line, they do not want to see this happen again.

9.10. One of their gathering space function needs includes pre-departure and post decompression meeting space for small groups. These orientations help prepare students for the culture shock.

9.11. Space for foreign visitors.

9.12. They run a large on-line advising center which needs dedicated, technology rich space.

9.13. Small and large conference/reception rooms with projectors for and power point presentations. Staff meetings have to go in the advising center, off hours at present.
9.14. Although not a need they try to formally meet, it was brought up that visiting scholars need temporary, short term housing. Resident scholar quarters somewhere on campus would be a big draw.

10. Department and/or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. IPO brings in Social Security representatives to help visiting students who need to work, get Social Security numbers. This streamlines the process for foreign students who need help finding their way through the process and to a Social Security office.

10.2. They also sponsor workshops on finding financial aid.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. IPO runs a heavily subscribed American Culture and Language Program (ACLP). This is a non-credit night course that has 2 to 3 classes that range in size from 10 to 25 seats each. They have difficulty getting classroom space even in evenings and their need is typically one of the last to be met because the course is not for credit.

11.2. IPO offers an occasional Lecture series, breakfast seminars and other special programs.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. None discussed.
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IPO- Frank Hughus
IPO- Erika Schluntz
IPO- Pat Vokbus
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Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
   1.1. Revisions were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
   3.1. See Attachment

4. Review Location Considerations:
4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):

4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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Space and Programmatic Needs
Of the International Programs Office
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The functions of International Programs Office (IPO) at a glance:
- to advise UMass students about study-abroad options, to send them abroad, and to support them while they are abroad;
- to advise and inform international applicants about federal policy, to bring international students to study at UMass, and to support them while they are here;
- to provide orientation and various informational sessions for incoming international students as well as for outgoing UMass students;
- to bring international scholars and faculty to campus and to support them while they are part of the UMass community;
- to work with the Graduate School, the Admissions Office, faculty, the administration, and staff to facilitate and carry out the functions above;
- to welcome and host international visitors and other dignitaries to campus, and
- to act as a resource for the campus (and for the UMass system) on academic international linkages.

* IPO serves approximately 4,500 – 5,000 students, researchers, and scholars annually.
* IPO hosts, or helps to host, dozens of visitors both from the US and from around the world.
* IPO is a twelve-month office with all permanent staff working on a year-round basis.

In order to fulfill its numerous responsibilities effectively, IPO needs:
- Administrative space at a central location on campus;
- 10,000 sq. ft. of space (ideally 15,000 sq. ft.);
- Offices for all advisors, the Associate Provost, the Director of Education Abroad, the Budget Manager (NOTE: for reasons of confidentiality cubicles are not an option);
- Advising Center for Education Abroad;
- Conference room for meetings, orientations;
- Storage for important academic and financial records and visa documents, etc.;
- Kitchen facility for hosting international events and study abroad.

If funding can be found, the ideal solution would be a separate “International Building” on campus to be used for all of the function described above as well as to provide accommodations and work space for visiting international scholars.

*A historical note in this context: IPO had its own building very briefly, the William S Clark International Center, which burnt down in spring of 1991. After the fire, our offices were moved temporarily to Goodell, then to Hills South, where there is currently not enough space for IPO’s various responsibilities.
IPO current staffing

1 Director of IPO
1 Education Abroad Director
12 professional staff
4 clerks/bookkeepers
4 graduate students
19 student workers

Current space in Hills South

17 offices (most with one person, several with two or three)
1 workroom/copy room
1 advising center
1 main office/receptionist area
1 storage room
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1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. LRC offers free academic support to improve student retention and graduation rates at UMass Amherst. LRC provides tutoring, supplemental instruction and media viewing facilities for many first and second year courses which students tend to find difficult. Students helping students enables the skills necessary to achieve college success. ¹

3.2. LRC runs 3 Programs:

3.2.1. Supplemental Instruction. Students who have done well in a course are hired to retake the course and lead 2 follow-up review sessions per week with students who wish to get additional help. This allows the leader to hear what is (and often more helpful what is not) said in the lecture so they can provide more insightful support. Student leaders are recommended by the course instructors. The courses tend to be large auditoria lectures and the follow-up sessions have supported as many as 120 students. No attendance is taken, just a head count.

3.2.2. Tutoring. This program runs on a walk-in basis with times published for when tutors will be available in the Center for specific course support. At exam times, appointments are made. Tutors meet one on one or with a small group at the discretion of the tutor. Tutoring is offered for specific courses based upon monitoring courses that have high failure and withdrawal rates. The greatest need comes from Math and Science courses.

3.2.3. Office of Undergraduate Research and Scholarship. This is a new program that helps students find internships, co-ops and summer jobs in research. They conduct predominately web based searches and look for opportunities nation and world wide. They also support students in resume writing, filling out applications and writing cover letters. 170 students have been placed through them in their first year.

3.3. The Tutoring program monitors help requests that can not be met and the reasons.

3.4. The tutors are all undergraduates and can limit the number of students they feel comfortable working with at one time.

3.5. The programs are a success judging by the high demand. LRC does not monitor grades or performance improvement.

3.6. The programs are late afternoon and evening based.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. Faculty & Staff: They have 3 Teaching Assistants and 2 Professional Staff including Susan Bronstein, Ed.D. Director.

4.2. There are 35 student tutors. Growth to as many as 80 could be envisioned.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. LRC is located on the 10th floor of the Dubois Library occupying 2,655 nsf. There is some intermingling with rooms assigned to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Library.

¹ Information excerpted from the Learning Resource Center Website.
5.2. They also rely heavily on rooms 1367 and 1349 on the thirteenth floor. 1367 is used 100% by LRC but has not been reassigned to them.

5.3. Supplemental Instruction rooms all have one computer each making it necessary to project when a group gets too large.

5.4. The floor has a large number of private study rooms that are very cramped for two person tutorial use. An open plan space with flexible tables and chairs might work for many tutorial sessions.

5.5. In general, the use of the small study room carrels has fallen off sense the Learning Common opened.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. The program has been in the Library for 15 to 20 years and the connection to the Library is strong especially with the large draw of the Learning Commons.

6.2. The Office of Undergraduate Research has ties to the Career Office.

6.3. The proximity to the Student Union is good.

6.4. A more visible location might suit the walk-in nature of the service and given the high demand for math and science help a center campus location may not be necessary.

6.5. In general, they are happy with the Library location and space.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None discussed.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. They could remove all carrels in favor of larger open plan tutoring space but no specific plans are in place.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. The Office of Undergraduate Research is limited by their space and their 17 computer stations for student and researcher use. This program works intensively over the summer to refresh their data base.

9.2. Open plan seems to work okay for one on one tutoring (several pods). The flexibility of an open plan allows for varying group sizes to congregate around a work station or table.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. The Office of Undergraduate Research participates in the Career Fair.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. (Exchange with other schools?)

12. Department Research Program

12.1. None discussed.
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Submitted by,

BURT HILL
/s/
Joel E. Nordberg
May 5, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Carol Harris

December 15, 2009

Subject/Project Number: Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs & Provost
Learning Resource Center

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
2 5/8/09 Information Gathering Facilities & Campus Planning
9:00 ST02

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
LRC- Susan Bronstein Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova Pavlova, Joel Nordberg
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:

   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

   2.2. Population & Personnel List:

   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

   3.1. The program could grow if given the space.

4. Review Location Considerations:

   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):

   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:
6. **Outline next steps:**
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1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations.

1.3.5. Department initiatives.

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Air Force ROTC (Reserve Officer Training Corps) is a college program designed to train and commission officers into the United States Air Force. AFROTC is like a campus club and a leadership training course rolled into one. It is a great place to meet new people who share similar interests and prepare yourself for the leadership position you will achieve with a commission as an officer in the world’s best Air and Space Force.

There are three primary areas of the ROTC program: academics, leadership training and physical fitness.

The program is divided into two main groups of students called cadets. In your first two years of ROTC, you will be a member of the General Military Course (GMC). Unless on scholarship, there is absolutely NO commitment to remain in ROTC or join the Air Force while you are in the GMC.

After your first two years, if you decide to remain in the program and pursue your commission, you will attend Field Training, a four-week training course (6 weeks in some circumstances) where you will develop your leadership skills and learn about the active duty Air Force first hand.

After Field Training, you will contract and become a member of the Professional Officer Corps (POC). Your final two years are spent in the Professional Officer Corps. The POC cadets conduct the leadership laboratories and manage the unit's cadet wing. The cadet wing is based on the Air Force organizational pattern of wing, group, squadron and flight. All members of the POC will have the opportunity to hold a position of significant leadership (wing, group, squadron or flight commander) at least once in their cadet career. Through this experience, you will gain the necessary skills and expertise to be an effective Air Force officer and a future leader in the U.S. Air Force. 1

A Power Point presentation was utilized and has been heavily relied upon for data in many of the notes below.

3.2. UMass Amherst’s AFROTC is one of 144 units nationwide, training Cadets to be commissioned into the USAF as 2nd Lieutenants upon graduation.

3.3. The program has diminished in numbers since the 1970s as has been the case nationwide. It now serves 45 Cadets in a four year program of 4 core courses (1 course per year), a Leadership lab (taken by all Cadets in each of their semesters/years), and a physical training program.

3.4. Graduates earn a minor in Aerospace Studies in addition to a major in their field of study. Majors tend to be in the liberal arts and less in science and engineering.

3.5. Based on the observations of the Northeast Region Commander, UMass’ facilities and support of AFROTC tends to be on the lean side of the 36 Units he visits annually in the region.

3.6. Dickenson was built for ROTC in the 1950s. The army program moved out and campus police moved in. No significant renovations have been undertaken in the ROTC spaces.

3.7. Financial Considerations:

3.7.1. AFROTC brings in a significant amount of federal scholarship dollars to the University. There are currently 19 Cadets on some level of scholarship amounting to $603,382.

3.7.2. There are a significant number of Cadets who would not be enrolled in the University if it were not for their AFROTC Scholarship. Each Scholarship generates $31,756 over the four year period, for the university. The USAF does not cap funding based on a number of students per Detachment.

---

1 Information excerpted from the Air Force ROTC Website.
3.7.3. There are 3 USAF professors whose salaries and full benefits are paid for by the USAF. UMass provides an Office Manager salary, space and utilities.

3.7.4. The program could grow with relatively low cost and generate more scholarship funded tuition as a benefit.

4. Department Headcount (Population)
   4.1. There are 6 assigned staff members, the office manager being the only civilian employee.
   4.2. There are currently 45 Cadets total. Freshman and Sophomore classes are larger due to normal attrition.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions
   5.1. AFROTC occupies 2,264 nsf, all in Dickinson Hall.
   5.2. The location is good but the condition of the facilities has been observed to be a detriment and to have a negative impression when recruiting students who are focused on AFROTC.
   5.3. In general the Dickinson spaces are bright and open but are in need of extensive renovation to bring them up to an acceptable level.
   5.4. The Cadet Room (204) is the most deficient space. More space is needed and the space needs offices for senior Cadets, adjacent to the main room for 1 on 1 interaction and mentoring between Cadets.
   5.5. They have 5 offices for 6 assigned staff members, 1 Cadet office with a computer, 2 storage areas, a small conference room/library. The offices are used in part for 1 to 1 counseling meetings with the cadets. They do not have a dedicated classroom and use corridor lockers for some of their storage needs.
   5.6. Administrative and support spaces include and Office Manager, 2 Enlisted Office Space, uniform storage and Recruiting supply storage. All are in need of significant upgrades to HVAC, carpet, windows, electrical, etc.
   5.7. All of their classes are taught in Dickinson. They rely on the large room (214/216) for their Leadership Laboratory where all 45 Cadets meet and work as one group, Tuesdays from 4:00 to 6:00.
   5.8. The Leadership Lab often breaks out into smaller groups in Dickinson or to activities outdoors. They use the open level of the garage for marching practice, however this is not a well suited area for their needs.
   5.9. The Department Chair’s office and the 2 Assist Professor Offices are good space but are in need of renovation especially in the building systems. Window are leaky and a great deal of construction dust is apparent.
   5.10. Intensive 1 on 1 counseling between Cadets and Cadre is a central part of the program which involves Privacy Act issues and makes private offices crucial.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)
   6.1. Cadet majors range across all colleges, making central their central location good. Cadets also use the building for individual study frequently.
   6.2. Adjacency to the gym in the new recreation building will work very well for their Physical Training work.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations
   7.1. None noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations
   8.1. It is anticipated that if they were housed in new facilities the Corp could attract more students who are interested in AFROTC and grow to 100 to 150. The new facility would need space for 6 dedicated Cadre offices, 2 – 400sf storage rooms, a Cadet study area with 5 offices embedded for Senior Cadet leadership.
   8.2. A less desirable scenario, would be to expand within a renovated and modernized Dickinson Building. They could maintain the existing offices, expand the Cadet room into the adjacent UMass classroom. Perhaps get the dedicated use of 214/216 (the combined UMass Classroom) when the numbers get to 100. Priority use of new gym should be considered for their Physical Training needs. There is less confidence in being able to fund
renovation work on campus and a concern that Dickinson will lose space in the course of renovation with the addition of an elevator and expanded HC toilets.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs
9.1. Growth of the program is anticipated with improved facilities.

9.2. The Cadet Office is a core identity space used for informal meetings, a staging area for special programs and study. The space should be roughly twice as big as the current room 204 and should have 4 to 6 medium size senior Cadet offices that open on to the mains space. These offices are used by rotating student leaders who need space for peer mentoring and occasional small group meetings.

9.3. Additional storage space is also needed for Honor Guard Equipments and other special program resources roughly the size of their existing storage room.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives
10.1. None discussed.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.2. The Leadership Laboratory is a student led course that brings Cadets in all levels together for training and hands on leadership experience. Faculty serve in an observing and advising role. Growth of the program would require larger space for this course as it is highly beneficial for the group to stay together and for student leaders to have the experience of work with as large a group as possible.

11.3. The Physical Training program uses campus facilities. They are looking forward to the opening of the new Recreation Building.

12. Comparables and Model Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purdue</th>
<th>Kent State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armory – middle of Campus, next to Pres bldg</td>
<td>Army &amp; AF share entire building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 SF office space</td>
<td>AF has 56,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 classrooms in Armory – 1 X 50, 2 X 30</td>
<td>6 separate offices for USAF staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football field size drill floor in the building</td>
<td>3 Cadet offices + Cadet library + Cadet lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Mike Silver “awesome facilities”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penn State</th>
<th>Michigan State Univ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armory – 50 X 100 Ft</td>
<td>Not co-located with Army ROTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One large dedicated classroom</td>
<td>Full office space for all cadre + 1 for visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three shared classrooms (ROTC primary)</td>
<td>Conference room for 15 w/ conf table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 separate offices for USAF staff</td>
<td>Access to 250 seat classroom (schedule adv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large Cadet office (50) + Cadet lounge</td>
<td>Unlimited access to two gyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Storage Area – “large basement facility”</td>
<td>Access to lighted, outdoor running track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Guard Storage Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of New Hampshire</td>
<td>Boston Univ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares bldg w/ Army ROTC – “old but adequate”</td>
<td>Large Brownstone 2 blocks from Fenway Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices for all cadre members</td>
<td>6 rooms of office space with front secty station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadet Computer room, Cadet office, Cadet lounge</td>
<td>Provides $500,000/yr in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large dedicated classroom &amp; supply room</td>
<td>No dedicated large classroom available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Room &amp; Board Grants from UNH to Cadets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Univ of Delaware                           |                                                    |
| Shares a bldg w/Army                       |                                                    |
| Office space for all cadre                 |                                                    |
| Large dedicated classroom (35 students)    |                                                    |
| Shared courtyard—formations, ceremonies, etc, but not big enough to practice drill/marching |                                                    |
| Free Army/AF dedicated parking by offices  |                                                    |
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Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
Airforce ROTC- John McEldowney
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
       2.1.1. Concerns with the poor condition of their facilities. Would like the space to be renovated, also a strong desire to be in a new facility was expressed.

2.2. Population & Personnel List:
2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:
   3.1. The department feels that if they were in a new building they would get better exposure and therefore grow.

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:
5. **Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:**

   5.1. Concerned of the impressions given to the campus of their program because of their facilities.

6. **Outline next steps:**
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1. Purpose
1.1. Tour department space.
1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
1.3. Address the following topics:
1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
1.3.3. Department location plans.
1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers a both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to addresses the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background information

3.1. Army ROTC (Reserve Officers' Training Corps) is one of the best leadership courses in the country and is part of your college curriculum. During classes, leadership labs, physical training and field training exercises, you will learn firsthand what it takes to lead others, motivate groups and conduct missions as an Officer in the Army. Upon graduation from Army ROTC, you will earn the bar of a Second Lieutenant and be commissioned into the Active Army, Army Reserve or Army National Guard and become a leader for life. ¹

3.2. Cadets earn degrees in their chosen fields and also a minor in Military Science.

A Power Point presentation was utilized and has been heavily relied upon for data in many of the notes below.

3.3. Army ROTC began in 1819 Norwich University. Milestones in the development of ROTC include: the Morrill Act (Land-Grant College Act) 1862; the National Defense Act of 1916; and, the Revitalization Act of 1964.

3.4. ROTC was established at UMASS in 1918.

3.5. Today 70% of all Army officers are graduates of the Army ROTC program.


3.7. UMass has a high national reputation, #17 of 272 programs!

3.8. AROTC benefits the University financially with scholarships students (over $641,406 for SY07/08).

3.9. The UMass program is ranked #17 of 272 Schools nationally.

3.10. Achievements include:

- 25 of 150 officers produced by this program have earned advanced degrees in the last 15 years.
- Roughly 30% of all Massachusetts Army National Guard and Reservists graduated from this program, the most from any program in the state
- Every year for the past 10 years the UMass program has produced at least 1 of the top 100 lieutenants commissioned nationally.

3.11. Summary:

- Army ROTC offers students Hands-On Leadership training not available anywhere else.
- Even students who don’t go on to become commissioned officers benefit greatly by the valuable experiences gained in ROTC.
- ROTC classes are taught by actual Army personnel.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

4.1. There are a total of 15 Officers/Faculty and staff that serve as the core of the Department.

4.2. There are currently 128 Cadets in the program. The program has been growing steadily over recent years and it is anticipated that they could reach 150 in the fall of 2009.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. Army ROTC occupies 2,826 nsf, the full area of the ROTC Building. The space program references a small amount of space in the “Provost’s Trailer” which has been removed from inventory.

¹ Information excerpted from the Army ROTC Website.
5.2. They like their current location and space. HVAC systems are not adequate. Lighting and general finishes are in need of upgrading.

5.3. Their building has adjacent parking which is a big plus for moving equipment and personnel.

5.4. They like the campus location as well.

6. **Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)**
   
   6.1. Army ROTC works with and supports teaching efforts in a number of areas including: School of nursing, Business School, Sciences, History and others.
   
   6.2. Support is provided to athletics & sporting event. They are well located to support this need.
   
   6.3. Color guard for athletics. Again, the location serves them well.
   
   6.4. They are part of the Campus emergency response plan.

7. **Current Relocations or Renovations**
   
   7.1. None noted.

8. **Proposed Relocations or Renovations**
   
   8.1. Informal discussions have taken place about relocating to rejoin AFROTC. They would however, prefer to stay where they are.

9. **Department Space and Technology Needs**
   
   9.1. Storage is needed for equipment. A second space roughly equal in size to their current room is needed. The room that they currently use is a mechanical room also which is not good.
   
   9.2. Their building is lacking in HVAC systems. General finishes are also worn and in need of replacement and refurbishment.

10. **Department and /or Faculty Initiatives**
   
   10.1. Army ROTC faculty teach as adjuncts in other programs.
   
   10.2. Army ROTC provides instructors and programs for general ed students in addition to specific programs for their Cadets. Areas include: Physical Education, Military Science, History (Iraq), Leadership Course Curriculum and others.

11. **Department Instructional Program**
   
   11.1. The Army ROTC program consists of one course per semester along with a leadership laboratory period each week.
   
   11.2. The four-year program is divided into two parts: Basic Program and Advanced Program. The Basic Program is usually taken in the freshman and sophomore years.
   
   11.3. Freshman Level Courses: Foundations of Officership, Increasing the students self-confidence by learning fundamental concepts of Leadership, Army Values and ethics and problem solving.
   
   11.4. Sophomore Level Courses: Individual Leadership Studies; Develop skills in oral presentations, writing concisely, coordination and planning of events, basic First Aid, Land Navigation (orienteering), time management and communication skills.
   
   11.5. Junior Level Courses: Leadership and problem solving, this course prepares the cadet for success at LDAC. Instruction in leadership is emphasized, students lead small groups and receive personal assessments which makes up the leadership development program.
   
   11.6. Senior Level Courses: Advanced Leadership and Management; advanced problem solving and decision making skills are emphasized. Develop skills in order to lead the cadet underclassmen throughout the year. Cadets will be given special areas of responsibility and be expected to show ability to lead groups successfully.
11.7. Topics include: Leadership Characteristics & Dimensions; Values & Ethics; Problem Solving; Time Management; Effective Oral & Written Communication Skills; Goal Setting; Physical Fitness; Team Building; Organizational Leadership; Communication; Motivation & Performance; Leadership & Management; Effective Decision Making; Tactical Leadership; Stress Management; Leadership Styles.

11.8. Army ROTC provides career opportunities in Active and Reserve service.

11.9. Federally Funded Instructors serve numerous roles and courses on campus.

11.10. AROTC is active in Campus and Community Outreach initiatives.

11.11. AROTC also provides Color Guards for University events.

11.12. Completed Events Fall ’08/09: Early Move-in, Field Training Events, Rappelling, Parents Welcome Brief

11.13. Other Training: Physical Fitness, Weekly Leadership Labs, Light-leaders club, Ranger Challenge, Field Training Exercise

11.14. Summer Training: Numerous Army Schools, Leader’s Training Course, Leadership Development And Assessment Course, Cadet Troop Leader Training

11.15. Summer VIP Tours: Travel to Fort Knox, KY, Fort Lewis, WA or Walter Reed Army Medical Center to see our programs in action

12. Department Research Program

12.1. None discussed.
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Meeting Date: 5/7/09
Meeting Date: 9:00
Project Phase: Information Gathering ST02
Meeting Location: Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:
Army ROTC- Andre Hinson
Army ROTC- Brenda Barrett
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Distribution:
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:
3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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1. Purpose

1.1. Tour department space.

1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.

1.3. Address the following topics:

1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.

1.3.2. Findings from building tours.

1.3.3. Department location plans.

1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations

1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview

2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).

2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:

2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.
2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to address the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background Information

3.1. The Undergraduate Advising and Learning Communities (UA&LC). We serve students who have not yet declared a major and wish to explore the wide array of academic programs and opportunities at the University, before committing to an academic field of study. Academic advising services are integrated with counseling services and specialized academic programs to enhance our students’ intellectual growth, personal development, and academic success. The New Students Orientation and Office of Parent Services are affiliated with UA&LC.  

3.2. Charged to work with undeclared students. Most are Freshman and it is presumed that students will declare a major by the end of their first year. They serve approximately 30% of the student population.

3.3. Among their programs are:

3.3.1. Residential Academic Programs (RAP). There are limitations due to the limited number of residential hall classrooms. Most dorms were not built with classrooms. The goal of the program is to bring students into a small academic/residential community. Admitted students elect to be in a Residential Academic Program. Some also do get invited. The roots of the program go back to when the school had residential faculty living in the halls.

3.3.2. 5 College interexchange. Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke and Smith colleges join with the University of Massachusetts to form the Five College Consortium, combining their academic activities in selected areas for the purpose of extending and enriching their collective educational resources. Students may elect to take courses off campus at any one or all of these institutions.

Recognized as one of the oldest and most successful consortia in American higher education, Five Colleges administers cooperative agreements that give students open access to everything from courses and library holdings to theatre auditions.  

3.3.3. OASIS (Opportunities for Academic Success with Individualized Support) The OASIS First-Year Seminar (EDUC-125) was designed specifically for students entering the University without a declared major. In addition to all the traditional topics found in first-year seminars, OASIS has a strong emphasis on major exploration. Students in OASIS work closely with their academic advisor as they complete exercises and activities to help clarify their individual goal and develop their personal academic plan. Sections are taught by advisors from Undergraduate Advising or others with programmatic connections to first-year students, and regular advising appointments with the advisor connected to the section are a requirement of the course.

3.3.4. Domestic Exchange: Gives students the opportunity to pursue studies in over 180 participating colleges and universities across the country.

3.4. UA&ASC participates in New student Orientation programs.

3.5. Domestic exchange includes both placement and reception of incoming students to UMass.

3.6. Their advisor group works with freshmen and other undeclared students on an every-other week basis.

3.7. The Academic Dean’s office tracks students who are potentially at risk. They also work with students who have more than 45 credits and have not declared a major.

1 Information excerpted from the Undergraduate Advising Website.
3.8. They see a lot of students who have not been accepted into some of the tough programs: engineering, nursing, communications, business school, art, music & dance.

4. **Department Headcount (Population)**

4.1. A breakdown of the Department employee list is as follows: Teaching Assistants, 8; Professional Staff, 19; Classified Staff, 6; Totaling 23.

4.2. There were approximately 30,000 applications to the University for this year (fairly level).

5. **Current Location and Space Conditions**

5.1. The Undergraduate Advising and **Learning Communities** occupies 10,232 nsf (3,260 sf in Goodell, 6,141 sf in the Goodell Addition and 831sf in John Quincy Adams House).

5.2. They have “Peculiar space” space, shaped by the old library building with its large central (problematic) space. The old central stack space is not usable and their space is not as large as it might look on a plan due to inefficiencies. The space shapes their program.

5.3. They have several very large spaces as a result of the library reading room, etc. which are not that efficient when set up in offices or office cubicles.

5.4. Most of their space must serve multi-purposes.

5.5. The OASIS room (604) serves as a Classroom and computer lab. It has no windows, limited ceiling height and very poor air quality. The room has also suffered from chronic leaks in the HVAC systems.

5.6. Problems are primarily with the fragmented nature of the space and hvac deficiencies.

5.7. The Mather Building houses, New Student Orientation (NSO) and the Office of Parent Services with whom they work closely. Its remote location is a problem. They are with admissions who need more space. NSO has 4 full time staff. Parent Services have 2 support staff.

5.8. The Academic Dean and Director have the only private offices.

5.9. The central campus location is good.

5.10. They hire a large summer staff for orientation help and tours.

5.11. In Summer they use of Bernie Dallas Room on fifth floor which works for presentations of 100 or more.

6. **Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)**

6.1. The Commonwealth College, DuBois Library, Center Campus are primary resources and exchanges.

7. **Current Relocations or Renovations**

7.1. No specific plans were discussed.

8. **Proposed Relocations or Renovations**

8.1. Their growth would be heavily impacted by the growth focus of the University. If more professional degree programs are expanded and students recruited, the demand might be less as these are typically students who come in with declared majors. If more liberal arts students come in, their load might increase.

8.2. If the growth target were more toward students in need or at risk, more advising would be necessary.

9. **Department Space and Technology Needs**

9.1. They have a definite need for private counseling space.

10. **Department and /or Faculty Initiatives**

10.1. Not discussed.

11. **Department Instructional Program**

11.1. Not discussed.
12. Department Research Program

12.1. Not discussed.
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Department Follow-up and Right Sizing
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UA&LC- Pamela Marsh Williams Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova
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Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:

1.1. Revisions were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.

2. Space & Personnel Review:

2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition

2.1.1. The Mather group is with admissions. They have discussed moving to Arnold (also the Campus Center, Res. Dining Common).

2.1.2. The Residence program office is OK.

2.2. Population & Personnel List:

2.2.1. Brings on 30 summer counselors.

2.2.2. 4,000 students on campus for orientation – team building.
2.2.3. Has a lot of equipment storage needs.

2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:
       4.2.1. UA&LC is in contact with other Advising offices within the Colleges.

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:

6. Outline next steps:
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1. Purpose
   1.1. Tour department space.
   1.2. Introduce project, parameters, schedule and objectives.
   1.3. Address the following topics:
       1.3.1. Existing and proposed population.
       1.3.2. Findings from building tours.
       1.3.3. Department location plans.
       1.3.4. Current and potential department relocations and renovations
       1.3.5. Department initiatives

2. Project Overview
   2.1. Ann Storer (AS) introduced the project and DCAM, the managing agency for the recently passed higher education bond bill. The bill includes funds for a New Academic and Classroom Building (NACB).
   2.2. The Study will be completed in two phases:
2.2.1. Phase I, the Comprehensive Academic and Classroom Plan (CACP), evaluates classroom space and department space and proposes a phased implementation plan that considers both a new building and renovations of existing buildings.

2.2.2. Phase II, the Certifiable Building Study (CBS) for the NACB prepares a basis of design for the new building.

2.3. AS noted the project is currently in the Information Gathering phase. At the end of this phase, the design team will right size each department and prepare a plan to address the NACB and renovations of existing buildings.

3. Department Background Information

3.1. Since 1982, we have been an independent academic unit serving the entire campus community. Our mission is to help students here acquire the writing skills they need in their courses, their careers, and their lives in general. We teach more than 4,000 students a year in our nationally-recognized First Year Writing Program (including Englwr 111: Basic Writing and Englwr 112: College Writing); we support more than 60 courses across campus as part of the University’s Junior Year Writing Program, named by U.S. News & World Report one of 25 “Programs that Work” in writing in the disciplines; we offer an innovative series of Experimental Writing Workshops for elective credit; we provide free tutoring for students of all levels in our popular Writing Center; and we sponsor an extensive Teacher Education Program for the nearly 100 graduate Teaching Associates who work for us.

First Year Writing is intended (in the words of the program’s 1982 founding document) “to enable students to write with more clarity and logic, with a confidence based on improved knowledge about the elements of prose style – language choices, correct grammar and spelling, strategies of organization, appropriate development, effective tone. Primary emphasis is on students’ writing rather than lectures, grammar exercises, or the analysis of prose models. The course will not attempt to introduce students to specialized intellectual disciplines as that can be done more effectively in introductory courses offered by faculty and graduate students in departments.”

In 1982, the University of Massachusetts Amherst instituted a groundbreaking two-part writing requirement for undergraduates, which included First Year Writing, satisfied by a common introductory course in general academic writing, and Junior Year Writing, satisfied by an advanced course in the student’s major, focused on the writing of that field and taught by faculty in that discipline. Ever since, UMass has been a leader in the development of student writing both through the college years and across the curriculum. In 2003, U.S. News & World Report named our Junior Year Writing Program one of 25 “Programs that Work” in writing in the disciplines. The program remains a key part of the University’s General Education effort. ¹

3.2. The Program reports to the Deputy Provost.

3.3. Writing has two focuses: to teach effective writing to students; and, training their TOs (teaching associates) to be good teachers.

3.4. They hold a Berkshire Dining Common orientation each year for first semester TOs that is a week long, all day session. The same group meets every other week throughout the year.

3.5. Their computer rooms on the 1st floor are fully booked.

3.6. They could use an open (unscheduled) classroom.

3.7. Need a work shop space, a large, 45 person room. It could serve multi uses and needs to be wired not but not necessarily a computer lab.

3.8. Their resource room is probably their “identity space” (#308).

3.9. Not a close relationship with ESL. Limited overlap as foreign students assimilate into the writing program.

4. Department Headcount (Population)

¹ Information excerpted from the Writing Center Website.
4.1. Faculty & Staff: 1 director, a ½ (full time) position. Dr. Fleming has given up his full time office in English while serving in the 4 year (cycling) chair position. 2 assistants, 1 deputy, 1 office manager, 1 reception/administrator, & approximately 100 TOs on one year contracts.

4.2. Personnel records show: 5 faculty, 76 TAs, 1 Grad Student, 4 Professional Staff, 2 Classified Staff, and 2 “other”; Totaling 91 at present.

5. Current Location and Space Conditions

5.1. The Writing Program occupies 8,195 nsf, all in Bartlett Hall of which 7,633sf belongs to the WP and 562sf are ESL.

5.2. Their space is spread widely on all three floors of Bartlett, in both wings.

5.2.1. TO’s work out of the lower level in old test room facilities built for Psychology. The rooms are very small. Room 68 is a large central open space with test rooms on the perimeter. All rooms are windowless with poor air quality and prone to overheating. Several of the rooms are next to a UMass classroom and have significant acoustic interference due to the abandoned observation windows. All offices are doubles.

5.2.2. Their primary first floor rooms are two large computer labs. The rooms have borrowed lights to the corridor and central observation area. The layouts work well but rely on noisy window air conditioners.

5.2.3. There are two (isolate) TO offices at the extreme north end of the north wing on the second floor.

5.2.4. Their main offices are on the third floor south wing.

5.3. They need a demonstration classroom for instructing young teachers.

5.4. All classrooms must be technology enabled classrooms for their needs.

5.5. Herter is used regularly for classes requiring 30 to 40 seats.

5.6. They use an auditorium for their annual general meetings which requires a space that can accommodate 100 plus.

6. Department Adjacencies (Neighborhoods)

6.1. A close relationship with English is critical. 95% of there TA’s are English Grade students.

6.2. They also have a partnership with the Library’s Writing Center and use the Calipari Room in the Learning Commons for their Intro to Research classes. The library also has the benefit of computer access for students and TOs.

6.3. The Campus Center sometimes gets used but is not encouraged, for casual meetings students and TOs.

6.4. There is some contact (coverage in the summer) for ESL and some potential for more interaction.

6.5. Although they have a heavy focus on training teachers, they have little contact with the School of Ed. Perhaps because of their remoteness.

7. Current Relocations or Renovations

7.1. None noted.

8. Proposed Relocations or Renovations

8.1. If Bartlett were emptied for renovation or demo, they would hope to stay clustered with English.

8.2. Although not previously considered relocating to the Library was discussed and could be a possibility.

9. Department Space and Technology Needs

9.1. Consolidation within Bartlett is highly desirable as they are extremely fragmented within Bartlett at present.

9.2. They need a printing/copy room for TOs, who now have to go to another building. A copy/printing room should not be in another remote space. It could be in another space (bullpen) and should have 10 computers.
and 2 printers. It should be its own space but probably close to the admin office. They would rather have OIT run it but this is unlikely. Students pay for printing at the library.

9.3. TOs are not supplied with computers. They tend to use their own lap tops or go to the Library.

10. Department and /or Faculty Initiatives

10.1. None noted.

11. Department Instructional Program

11.1. They seek out TO candidates that will make good teachers.

11.2. They provide Support for Junior Year Writing program. Each major has its own advanced writing course, however.

11.3. The “Writing Center” in the Library is open to any student, and grad student and is staffed and managed by the Writing Program.

12. Department Research Program

12.1. None noted.
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Submitted by,

BURT HILL
/s/
Joel E. Nordberg
May 5, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Carol Harris

Subject/Project Number: Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs & Provost Writing Program & ESL

New Academic Classroom Facilities University of Massachusetts – Amherst Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1 Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2
Meeting Date: 5/8/09
Meeting Location: Information Gathering ST02

Meeting Purpose:
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees: Distribution:
Writing – David Fleming
UMass F&CP- Ludmilla Pavlova
DCAM- Ann Storer
Burt Hill- Michael Reagan, Joel Nordberg

Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments: A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. Corrections and additions to Meeting Minutes #1:
   1.1. Revisions were conveyed and revised minutes will be issued by Burt Hill.

2. Space & Personnel Review:
   2.1. Current Use square footage, location and condition
   2.2. Population & Personnel List:
   2.3. Review “Right-Size” comparison:

3. Discuss likely growth and any un-noted space needs:

4. Review Location Considerations:
   4.1. Department configuration (fragmentation within and/or across buildings):
   4.2. On Campus relative to collaborations with other departments, administration and necessary external resources:

5. Review considerations that may factor into necessary or desirable relocation:
6. Outline next steps:

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL

/s/
Joel E. Nordberg, CJH
December 15, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Carol Harris  

Subject/Project Number:  

Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs & Provost  
Provost’s Office

New Academic Classroom Facilities  
University of Massachusetts – Amherst  
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1  
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number:  
Meeting Date:  
Project Phase:  
Meeting Location:

1  
7/21/09  
9:00  
Information Gathering  
Facilities & Campus Planning

Meeting Purpose:  
Department Follow-up and Right Sizing

Attendees:  

Distribution:

VCAAP- John Cunningham  
UMass F&CP- Susan Personnette, Ludmilla Pavlova  
DCAM- Ann Storer  
Burt Hill- Joel Nordberg, Carol Harris  
Ann Storer, Ludmilla Pavlova, Joel Nordberg

Comments:  A Draft Department Profile report section containing a summary, photographs of the Department, current personnel and space right-sizing, a room list by square foot and personnel list were distributed for correction and confirmation.

1. International Programs Office

2. Airforce ROTC  
   2.1. The conditions of Middlesex are poor.  
   2.2. The program’s future is in question.

3. Army ROTC

4. Learning Resource Center

5. Undergraduate Advising and Learning Communities

6. Writing Program & ESL  
   6.1. Used by undeclared students
This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL
/s/
Carol Harris
December 16, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA
Subject/Project Number: UMass Amherst - New Academic Classroom Facilities
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:

Meeting Purpose:

Attendees: Distribution:
Burt Hill All Attendees

Comments: Action By/Due Date:
Contract
WBE MBE
A conference
Materials
Schedule (broad brush)
DCAM Info
Share Sites (Ann & Tom)

1. Contract
   a. WBE
2. Landscape – In-house for high level scope. Copley Wolff would do the final design, detailing and planting.
3. Schedule
   a. Signing
   b. A Conference Staged;
      1) Short term abbreviated Dec. 4th or 8th (TBD)
      2) Possible observation opportunity for 12/5
      3) Might be a good week for a site visit (11 Set in Amherst)
         a) Work
      4) Larger format Jan 7
   c. Sequence of coordination mtg with Acad. Team (wk of the 8th) – then with Wilson (12/17) – then with Deans
   d. Next call Friday
4. Workshop dates must plug into Science dates
   • A Conference agenda
   Ann to send Wilson
   Spring schedule
5. Building tours
   a. Ideal holiday break
   b. Fall term ends 12/12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th>Action By/Due Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Spring term begins 1/26/09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Prioritize to put Work Plan together before starting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SharePoint (Ginelle, Michael &amp; Me)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Used as FTP site for file sharing</td>
<td>Tom to send access codes today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Has brand new aerial photos</td>
<td>Joel to send added names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working on color coded plans (departments &amp; room use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Wilson had these in hand for building surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Burt Hill is setting up a site in our system also</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Building List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Data information (Burt Hill has some from briefing hand-outs) – comprehensive data to be reviewed and clean-ed up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. DCAM Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sample of a good Certifiable Study (Payette – Bridgewater Science Center)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ann is e-mailing her draft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

**BURT HILL**

/s/
Joel E. Nordberg, AIA
November 14, 2008
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA

Subject/Project Number:
UMass Amherst - New Academic Classroom Facilities
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2  Meeting Date: Nov. 21, 2008
Project Phase: Meeting Location: Conf. Call - 9:00

Meeting Purpose:
Review Contract Items & Schedule Dates

Attendees: Distribution:
Burt Hill Joel Nordberg, Ginelle Lang, Michael Reagan, Amy Carey
All Attendees Alex Wing, Tom Huf, Dave Linamen, Jeff Funovits

Comments: Action By/Due Date:

1. M/WBE
   a. Asking for clarification from Ripton Rowe       JEN
   b. Ann will follow-up on her side

2. Contract
   a. In our court – we assume that our Counsel is in contact with appropriate
      DCAM Counsel.                                 JEN follow-up with
   b. Problem over who can sign and how much review time is needed prior to
      signing. Reschedule dates seems unavoidable.  Greg Jarold

3. Schedule targets
   a. Contract Signing – 12/ 1, 2, 3 Pending confirmation with Harry
   b. A Conference (Part I)12/4th (afternoon)/ Back-up days 8 (afternoon), 9
      (afternoon) or 10 (morning) (if Contract is not signed)
      (PM) with Ann piggy-backed with A Conference
   d. Work Plan – Progress Review – check-in on the 8th (PM) Ann here & Tom
   e. Work Plan – Progress Review – check-in-10th (AM)
   f. UMass meeting 12/11 (in Amherst)
      1) Jim Cahill (Walk thru of Work Plan)
      2) Utilization Contact face-to-face Brian Harvey? & Alex Wing – Facility
      3) Work Plan follow-up work session after main meeting
   g. Invitation to observe Science Project presentation 12/17
   h. No meeting on 1/5/09
   i. Meeting on 1/7/09 Part II – A Conference – no Michael Reagan (location /
      time?)

DCAM confirm to location
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th>Action By/Due Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Building Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Early Start in December pending availability of UMass &amp; DCAM key participants (shooting for week of the 15th)</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Also need building manager’s buy-in their availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Burt Hill to propose on building survey schedule for December &amp; January</td>
<td>DCAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Ann will take proposal to UMass for blocking out of available buildings and personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Work intensive in December (In-house &amp; with Ann)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Burt Hill should propose a schedule and delivery date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 12/11 Presentation of working plan to UMass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Data Upload from U Mass has occurred. Ann to review content and forward link to Burt Hill</td>
<td>DCAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

**BURT HILL**

/s/
Joel E. Nordberg, AIA
November 21, 2008
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA

Subject/Project Number:
UMass Amherst - New Academic Classroom Facilities
DCAM Project UMA 0801STI
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 1 Meeting Date: 12/4/08 Project Phase: Workplan Meeting Location: 303 C

Meeting Purpose: Workplan Workshop

Attendees: Distribution:
Ann Storer - DCAM All Attendees
Alex Wing, Ginelle Lang, Joel Nordberg - Burt Hill

Ann/UMass

Action By/Due Date:

1. Schedule
   a. 12/11 meeting with Jim Cahill & Provost moved to 12/17 AM in Boston (Burt
      Hill’s office). As to confirm 8:30 to 12:30 at Burt Hill. Burt Hill to prepare
      agenda for review by DCAM and UMass.
   b. Schedule classroom utilization conference call on the 11th. (Brian Harvey,
      Registrar) @ 10:30 to include Jim and Bryan.
   c. 1/7/09 A Conference Part II with Wilson Architects at DCAM. This will be a
      joint meeting with the Science team to hear DCAM presentations.
   d. Proposed joint classroom meeting with Deans & Provost on 1/8/09 in Amherst
   e. The Certifiable Building Study is targeted to start 6 months from contract
      signing on 12/05.
   f. The standard DCAM project timeline is 1,326 days for study & construction.
      More information will be coming on this 1/7/09 and in future meetings.
   g. A calendar of Science Study activities was handed out for the purpose of
      coordinating Academic meetings, workshops and building tours.

2. Process
   a. Burt Hill will meet Ron Ferrara, DCAM Construction Manager, at the January
      7th conference.
   b. AS will request from UMass a list of recent and ongoing relevant and related
      campus projects
   c. Project team needs definitive list of departments to schedule meetings and stay
      on overall schedule. Adding additional departments after ST02 / Information
      Gathering and programming is in process could put the schedule and decision
      making at risk.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th>Action By/Due Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Burt Hill to become familiar with dept. bios, mission statements, etc. from dept. websites.</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. AS to send Burt Hill copies of DCAM specification standards and cost estimating guidelines.</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Existing Building Scope
   a. The best list is the color coded (Academic Study is highlighted in yellow) campus list. Currently there are 22 buildings in survey and 24 – 27 departments (this needs to be confirmed by F&CP).
   b. Ann will solicit UMass confirmation of the final list.
   c. Commonwealth College needs to be included on the list.

4. Classroom Utilization
   a. A sample utilization diagram from UMass / Brian Harvey (BH) – Assistant Provost was distributed and indicated that there is good ground work in place.
   b. Burt Hill, Alex Wing (AW) needs background, electronic data and face to face meetings with Brian Harvey (UMass) to review classroom information.
   c. Some amount of fundamental (computer) programming will be needed by Burt Hill to get a good picture of the patterns of use.
   d. Burt Hill to showcase to Mike Williams classroom utilization software at the A Conference.
   e. Question over interoperability of electronic data format for study with UMass F&CP systems. This could go to a level beyond what is contracted. This would require some additional services if UMass wishes to take the programming farther for their continued use.
   f. Pam Rooney, Assistant Director of Space, manages the space data base and is part of the project team. AS to coordinate conf call with BH and Registrar to solicit data early next week and then a second conf call on Thursday to review questions and process for classroom utilization with Jim Cahill and BH

5. Facilities Use
   a. Room use & capacity documentation seems to be available. It appears that the data base is very complete based upon pre-interview walk through, hardcopy handouts. Access to the information in electronic format is essential.
   b. Building tour focus will primarily be on conditions and room set-up if utilization is well documented.
   c. Rooms are UMass or department “owned” depending on location and use.
   d. Need to keep big picture questions in mind – interdepartmental academic communities (neighborhoods)

6. Workshops
   a. Science project held seven 1 ½ hour department per day. Grouping departments in the same meeting did not work.
   b. Note taking has proved to be a major undertaking.
   c. Burt Hill will propose a format and schedule in the workplan.

7. Workplan Tasks - based on Workplan template and Science Study sample
   a. Review existing studies - Ann left hard copy of all reports she has reviewed (Space Utilization study, Campus Physical Master Plan Update, Northern Area Plan, NE Area Plan, North Area Plan, Stockbridge District Master Plan (science prime),aerial photographs. Ginelle will catalog and uploaded to our website
b. AS will request from UMass a list of relevant and related campus projects comparison. This would include the current Library study and MEP and/or façade studies for individual buildings.
d. Existing building plans:
1) UMass to upload drawings starting Wed if not sooner.
2) Team of Eng & Arch & others. Burt Hill is to outline approach and proposed schedule for review and schedule coordination.
3) Photographing each room is key to minimize need for cycle-back.
4) Survey system and team needs to be consistent to make information consistent (photographer, equipment review & overview person).
5) Building ratings between the Science Study and the Academic Study should be consistent.
6) MEP survey should go on in parallel with Arch review but may be at its own pace. Opportunity to compare notes while on site should be scheduled.
7) Common areas & building envelope need to be observed and rated as well.
8) Mechanical rating system will be established and has proved to be a controlling factor in repurposing decisions in Science project.
9) Department space (faculty offices, etc.) will be a separate category of space with addition department head input.
10) CAFM system interaction (software is currently being upgraded by UMass)

e. Campus Plan & potential site orientation
1) Burt Hill would like to start site development in December if possible, as it can: be its own task, overlapping other ST02 / Information Gathering activities; and, better evaluated prior to the snow season.
2) Follow-up organization and scheduling is needed. This should be an agenda topic for 12/17 or before.
3) UMass to provide site options and existing site information.

f. Discovery Workshops
1) A 3 stage approach is currently being considered.
   a) Building tours and Information Gathering meetings with departments and other stakeholder/ oversight groups.
   b) Potential Solutions workshops with departments and other stakeholder oversight groups.
   c) Consensus workshops would be with leadership and oversight group levels.

The task review was limited by time and will be continued in upcoming work sessions.

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL
/s/
Joel E. Nordberg, AIA  (DCAM Review Comments incorporated)
December 9, 2008
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA December 11, 2008

Subject/Project Number:
New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 2  Meeting Date: 12/11/08  Project Phase: Planning  Meeting Location: Conference Call

Meeting Purpose:
Organizational and Classroom Utilization Background and Approach

Attendees: Ann Storer – DCAM, Jim Cahill, Tom Huff, John Lenzi (registrar), Bryan Harvey, Susan Personette, Pam Rooney, Lou Pavlova – UMass Amherst, Alex Wing, Ginelle Lang, Joel Nordberg - Burt Hill

Distribution: All Attendees

Comments: Action By/Due Date:

1. Last space utilization study
   a. Managing capacity – scheduling all classes to room capacity
   b. Auditoria are Standard time is 99% booked (9:00 to 4:00 or 5:00), demand is also heavy on non standard time.
   c.
2. Burt Hill Methodology
   a. Previous studies 2004 Draft 2005, Summary pg. 163
   b. CFP and another consultant are currently engaged, doing analysis with their proprietary software (Sim 2000).
   c. Burt Hill has raw data that CFP has been working with.
   d. Open question of how much use
3. UMass Classroom Background
   a. Objectives
   b. Previous Studies
   c. John Lenzi
      1) Big pressure on auditoria from faculty and department to teach larger classes
      2) New courses or efficiency of teaching a larger class over multiple
      3) Increase enrollment (1300 seats in past 5 years)
      4) Total enrolled seats every course every seat every hour 113,000 seats to 127,000 seats
5) Increased course offerings and more schedule conflicts for student required courses. Increasing challenge for students to get into
6) 19,300 under graduates (24,000 total) – highest enrollment of all time. It is unlikely that enrollments will increase. There are a lot of internal and external pressures to get bigger.
7) Alex requested utilization data showing impact on student educational plan as effected by class availability and filled courses. Current software does not show
8) Discussion groups have put seminar (20 to 29 seats) at a premium
9) A shortage is also found in 45 seat classrooms. This has become a new problem brought on by new courses. There was thought to be a surplus in this size just a few years ago.
10) Large auditoria classes are spawning more follow-up discussion seminars which are spilling into the 45 seat rooms.
11) There is a big gap between 45 seat rooms and the large auditoria spaces. There are almost no rooms in the 75 to 100 seat range.
12) Are class times contributing to problem? Difficult to change (50 minute hour). Friday is still a problematic gap in scheduling.
13) Will need to look at optimal class size for specific curriculum. Classes are spilling into Auditorium at present do to demand for classes.

4. Burt Hill Methodology
   a. Lebanon sample of graphing is not tied to scheduling software which could be done if benefit were seen.
   b. We need to set up standards and classify rooms
   c. Flexible use rooms with multiple functional layouts can help balance peaks and valleys in use. Usually layouts do not change from day to day or hour to hour because of custodial demand. They are typically set up on a semester by semester basis.

   d. Bartlett and Machmer have had some classrooms subdivided into office suites which may present an opportunity to reclaim classroom. These are buildings noted to have major problems requiring gut level renovation with questionable results. Cosmetic upgrades can and have been done, but are seen as a transitional bridge until new classrooms can be brought on.

   6. 50 noted rooms with huge teaching deficiencies (several auditoria referred to as “the Pitt”)


   8. 120 programs. Questionable need to track core vs track vs elective courses.

   9. Program growth and trend over time.

   10. Allowance for overbooking cushion in the schedule. May lead to planning for scheduling smaller classes in larger rooms

   11. Sometimes room locations are changed as an accessibility accommodation for rooms in non-accessible buildings.

   12. Differentiate between specialty rooms (dedicated) (i.e. music practice) and general rooms. Sp

   13. Next steps
      a. Determine Room Sets
      b. Map Existing Utilization Patterns
         1) By room type
         2) Dept
3) Location

c.

14. 243 classrooms exact number is undermined and it is unclear whether specialty room like music practice. This needs to be clarified for all parties.

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL

/s/

Joel E. Nordberg, AIA

December 11, 2008
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA

December 17, 2008

Subject/Project Number:

New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 12.17.08
Project Phase: Planning
Meeting Date: 12.17.08
Meeting Location: 303 Congress Street

Meeting Purpose:

Project Kick-off

Attendees: Pamela Rooney, Ludmilla Pavlova, Susan Personette, Jim Cahill, Brian Harvey - UMass
Ann Storer - DCAM
Michael Reagan, Ginelle Lang, Alex Wing, Steven Brittan, Burt Hill

Comments: Action By/Due Date:

1. Introductions:
   a. Pam – knows departments, special interests in preservation and back-fill opportunities
   c. Susan – Background with MIT, Middleberry, working on campus master plan
   d. Alex Wing – scheduling & programming – data base development

2. Communication within the Campus needs some tuning from Science process
   a. Campus constituent groups
   b. Deans’ group presented to Executive (will involve both Academic and Science)
   c. Classroom group was used in Science but will overlap with
   d. UMass will provide names of individuals in each group.
   e. Anticipate a lot of interest in teaching space
      1) Faculty Senate
   f. Chancellor makes ultimate decision
   g. Departments input is limited – occupiers of space.
      1) Departments should be pressed for vision of how they would like to use their space.
   h. Burt Hill assumes buy-in by users is critical – leadership
3. Campus needs to identify goals – perspective has changed somewhat in recent months. Infrastructure issues will be more difficult to assess while maintaining high enrollment pressure will not abate.

4. Campus vision
   a. Budget limitations to “just moving people around”
   b. Determination of what set (of programs) are worth growing.
   c. Problem of having a long series of small renovations may be too expensive to undo.
   d. 18% decline expected in potential college age students entering college.
   e. UMass is in a very competitive college market and recognizes the need to improve educational product.
   f. Differing views as to what a flagship university is (open to all or exclusive pinnacle place in the state system).
   g. Risk benefit analysis needed in looking at how much money should be invested in some of the buildings. There are a lot of “tired” buildings.
   h. Adaptive use questions around center campus building (Library which wants to downsize its collections, some classroom space (converted to offices) could be reclaimed by relocating offices).
   i. No place to recreate space – everything is in use.
   j. Consideration for using some of new building space as swing space for subsequent renovations.
   k. Campus neighborhoods are being shaped and defined.

5. Communication Ideas
   a. Large scale, open to all information presentation. Possibly a web-cast.
   b. Need a sequence of pre-meetings with Deans & Leadership to layout goals before trying to a semi-public forum.
   c. Launch could help get a lot of the orientation message time out of workshops.
   d. Announcement bulletin – maybe in the form of a launch meeting invitation.
   e. Questionnaire could be used after the launch meeting.
   f. Introduce structure of Executive Committee, Deans Committee, etc.
   g. Chancellor may but probably not have a role
   h. Need to distinguish between facility conditions and academic vision
   i. Physical issues can be gathered and understood well without users. Users should be asked how their delivery is or is not served by the space.

6. Building Delivery Alternative
   a. Federal funding may be more immediately available with an opportunity to start expansion space much sooner that working through the full planning & study process.
   b. Any federal funds would have to be used within 2 years.
   c. Potential that a swing space building could be built immediately while study proceeds for future new buildings and backfill.
   d. Some level of assessment of need would be needed.
   e. Possibility of building classroom space that with minimal or now departmental space.
   f. Tennis court site, Science precinct, Human Science area to east, Business school addition.
   g. Bartlett is in very bad condition and is badly sited, blocking extraordinary views from the main quad to the west. Use of the tennis court site should take

7. Going Forward with building survey & tours
   a. Availability for key personnel in January
b. Discussing a more targeted, guided tour approach.
c. Need Deans meeting scheduled (pre-launch)
d. Use of January
   1) Building review
   2) Use patterns (departments & classrooms)
   3) Digesting and presenting current utilization program
e. Early February Deans meeting where program & building reviews for content.
f. Building plans should be up for 16 of the buildings on share point site.
   1) Room number 3 part ID (building, floor & room)
g. Also to include space data
h. Looking for similar project comparisons
i. Library
   1) There is a completed code study for the library. (2007)
   2) What is “Library of the Future”? Pushing to move beyond library as a building.
   3) Discussions on Library reuse should start in January. Librarians & Brian Harvey)
   4) Stacks are unprotected steel that will all have to be removed.
   5) A great deal of under utilized, central campus space, but very expensive to reclaim.
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BURT HILL
/s/
Joel E. Nordberg, AIA
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MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA

Subject/Project Number:
New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: Meeting Date: Project Phase: Meeting Location:
2 February 2009 Work Plan Conference Call

Meeting Purpose:
Weekly Coordination

Attendees: Distribution:
Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova – Umass
Ann Storer – DCAM
Alex Wing, Emily Santilli, Michael Reagan, Amy Carey, Pat Murphy (Questionnaire only), Joel Nordberg – Burt Hill
All Attendees

Comments: Action By/Due Date:

1. Schedule (General discussion on Short Term Schedule distributed with Agenda)
   a. Science Workshops scheduled for the 1st, 2nd & 4th weeks of February have an
      impact on the availability of some of the study team.
   b. The 3rd week gives us some opportunity to meet or schedule site work (See
      Campus Plan/Site Selection – Item 8 comments below).
   c. It was hoped that the meeting with Jim Cahill could be set for the week of
      2/23, Monday or Friday around science workshops. This would allow the
      kick-off meeting with the Deans and circulation of the questionnaire to be
      moved up.
   d. Overall, the sequence outlined moves the Information Gathering and Data
      Analysis phase out 4 to 6 weeks beyond the current draft workplan schedule.
   e. A more in-depth look is needed at “decoupling” the planning and study
      phases. Starting the building study and schematics for a generic academic
      building in parallel with the planning phase could keep the project on the
      overall schedule.
   f. Ann requested that bars be added to the workplan schedule for the primary
      information gathering tasks: 1) department utilization, 2) classroom utilization,
      3) site analysis and 4) building conditions analysis; to illustrate how
      departmental information gathering was driving the schedule out.

2. Required information for starting the building study early included:
   a. Site analysis and selection, which can start relatively soon. (see below)
   b. Rough square foot costs for academic buildings for use in determining general
      UMA

BH with AS (later this week)
BH (by next week’s
building scale and the quantity of various types of space that can be built for the budget.

c. Desired classroom mix (size and characteristics). This will not be known for some time and could be affected by who the primary user of the new building is. This may not be known for a long while. A good estimation of the optimal classroom mix can probably be worked out for schematic design with the Provost and Registrar.

d. Departmental space needs would have to be arrived at per (c) above.

e. A hypothetical program for an academic building would be good to have for the first meeting with Jim Cahill. (see schedule discussion below)

f. DCAM also has building cost information on comparable academic buildings.

3. The level of development of the classroom utilization data needed for a preliminary meeting with Jim Cahill and subsequent meetings with the Deans was described as:
   a. An executive level report comparing current conditions with that documented in the last utilization study.
   b. General report on classrooms and building condition observations.
   c. Observations on highly utilized classrooms.

4. It was noted that this would be an early overview of data and that information would be obtained, compiled and interpreted in layers as new information comes in through workshops, questionnaires and other sources not currently available.

5. Some form of graphic mapping of utilization (classrooms & departmental spaces) should be illustrated on the Campus building map for the planning study.

6. Target dates for the pre-Dean orientation meeting with Jim Cahill were set for either Monday 2/23 or 2/27. Ludmilla and Susan will try to make arrangements. Brian Harvey should be included also. Agenda to include:
   a. An update of the progress of the academic (departmental & classroom) plan including a comparison with the last study.
   b. Schedule review including the 4 information gathering task tracks requested.
   c. Preliminary building conditions observations.
   d. Expectations for stack-holders participation (questionnaire, tours, workshops, etc.)
   e. New building scale & size expectation for budget ($85 mil - project, $62 mil - const. cost)
   f. Questionnaire draft should be made available in advance of meeting.
   g. The summary should be made in a Power-point format.

7. Questionnaire process and content discussions:
   a. The Registrar should review and have input prior to issuing the questionnaire(s).
   b. Burt Hill will give further consideration to how to design the questionnaire(s) to gather department and classroom utilization information. Whether it is one or two questionnaires, the information will have to report to one data base.
   c. The questionnaire must be web based to manage the information efficiently.
   d. A name was requested on the draft as was department and location information. The potential benefits of anonymity will be further considered.
   e. 736 faculty members are listed. It is unclear what categories of faculty are included in that number. The questionnaire could have a drop down for faculty levels (tenured, adjunct, associate, etc.). DCAM will provide a list used on the science project.
   f. 2,200 department staff positions are noted. Questionnaires will be directed only to department heads and chairpersons.
   g. Other statistical information may be available through human resources data.
Comments:  Action By/Due Date:

h. Department heads will be asked to provide staff/office seat information which cannot be gathered on the questionnaire.

i. Specific question comments:
   1) Best and worst building question should be expanded to include best and worst classrooms.
   2) Classroom characteristics should be grouped and categorized.
   3) Seating types might also address rolling verses stationary seating.
   4) "Raked seating" should be changed to tiered or a more recognized description.
   5) Expand table types to larger seminar (6 to 8) seat tables.
   6) Questions should be added or expanded to query pedagogy style, space related facilitation or limitations.
   7) Add "zero" minutes to travel distance questions.
   8) Add age & years teaching to questionnaire (dependant on anonymity decision).

8. Site selection launch, tour and brainstorming meeting was proposed for 2/18 with a walk through in the morning and meeting in the afternoon. Set-up items include:
   a. Confirming Jim Cahill availability. (also Brian Harvey, especially if Library is included).
   b. Work out with Jim Cahill who should be at the site meeting from the University. Andy, Juanita, ?
   c. There is no established campus planning committee.
   d. Discussion could include utility and physical plant participation but should probably be kept at higher level design discussions.

9. The meeting should be expanded to include thoughts on modifications and repurposing of the library.
   a. Confirmation of availability is needed.
   b. Internal UMA discussion should take place to identify who should represent the library in initial and subsequent planning meetings.

10. The next phone conference will be Monday 2/9, 11:00 – 12:30.
    a. Burt Hill will set up the call-in number and circulate an agenda.
    b. Please submit any particular agenda items in advance for inclusion.
    c. No call in on the Presidents day holiday (2/16) A limited meeting could take place around the 2/18 meeting.

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient’s understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.

Submitted by,

BURT HILL
/s/
Joel E. Nordberg, AIA
February 3, 2009
MEETING MINUTES

From: Joel E. Nordberg, AIA

February 13, 2009

Subject/Project Number:
New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number: 3  Meeting Date: 9 February 2009  Project Phase: Work Plan & Info Gathering  Meeting Location: Conference Call

Meeting Purpose:

Attendees: Susan Personette, Ludmilla Pavlova – Umass
Ann Storer – DCAM
Alex Wing, Joel Nordberg, Pat Murphy – Burt Hill

Distribution: All Attendees

Comments: Action By/Due Date:

SCHEDULE
1. Schedule discussion gravitated to task 3 (Departmental Data Gathering) on the 2/3/09 schedule Ann developed along the 4 information gathering tasks (addressed in more detail in note 2 below).
   a. Burt Hill will incorporate these tasks into their project schedule to help illustrate how the current information gathering (departmental interview work in particular) affects the overall schedule and a critical path.
   b. It seems better to try to accelerate the Certifiable Study than to start it earlier – before June 1. Burt Hill will consider.
   c. 3 days of department meetings in a row is probably the manageable limit (Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday). A week off in between meeting weeks would help reorganize, keep up with meeting minutes and keep other planning work moving. Burt will incorporate this approach into the schedule for review.

2. Departmental Meetings:
   a. Each of the 4 science departmental meetings have a specific purpose: 1) an overview of program space, tour of existing conditions and verification of file background information; 2) verification of population information and right sizing exercises; 3) consideration of possible reorganizations or replanning; and, 4) a “role-up” of information into summary plan presentation back to the College level. It was felt that these general themes must be covered but that the process could be streamlined into 2 interview sessions and a presentation to the Colleges.
   b. It was reiterated that the Deans will not have specific information on
departmental utilization of their space and that the Departments must each be engaged directly.

Burt Hill felt that the primary goals of: evaluating present program areas for rightsizing; and, understanding adjacencies that stimulate collaboration and education could get bogged down in detailed lists of FFE problems that cannot be effectively addressed in the academic plan study.

It was clarified that this is to be an overview academic plan – not a department by department reprogramming/renovation plan.

The agenda for the interview meetings must be tight and adhered to, to stay on track. Burt Hill will continue to work out the schedule and meeting content/agendas.

CLASSROOM UTILIZATION PROGRESS UPDATE

3. Classroom Utilization:
   a. Outlined global approach underway, to develop data patterns through database reports by: seat fill, room fill, room types, etc.
   b. Alex is looking for ways to weave selective survey information such as room ranking and qualitative information from the questionnaire into the utilization database.
   c. Burt Hill has strong interest in working with Facility and Planning’s GIS model. A phone conference was set for 1:30 Monday with the Facility & Campus Planning team who have been working on the model to begin discussions that could connect building and department data from the study to the model.
   d. Alex was asked to write up a summary of goals and deliverables for the classroom utilization work for inclusion in the Work Plan

4. Goals:
   a. Clustering classrooms around departmental space would probably be a welcome thing to all departments but probably not practical in the near term.
   b. Burt Hill will document what the relationships are (between department locations and the classrooms they use) to establish current patterns and potential for improvements.
   c. Strengthening classroom and department clusters will be important criteria in siting and planning of the new building.
   d. Susan recommended that benchmarking be used to document the intensity of classroom use at UMA relative to other peer institutions.
      1) It is assumed that UMass’ classrooms are heavily overused compared to other peer institutions.
      2) A chart that UMass put together has been circulated indicating the frequency and level of auditoria use. This might be a useful illustration for other types of class rooms.

UPCOMING MEETINGS AND SESSIONS

5. Site planning meeting scheduled for the 18th:
   a. Morning site walk of the campus and identified potential sites.
      1) Site tour will focus on
         a) Conveying a general understanding of the campus organization from campus staff.
         b) Known potential sites.
         c) Identifying other potential sites from outside perspective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th>Action By/Due Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Meeting with Jim, Brian and the site committee (campus vision group) 1:00 to 4:00 to get their perspective, share our observations and begin the process of site analysis and selection. Burt Hill will prepare an agenda.</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A key element will be a footprint area range for a $60 mil building for comparison with other campus buildings.</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Library discussion will not be part of the meeting on the 18th as initially thought.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. There are a number of differing opinions on the library building and program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. UMass has proposed getting a proposal for a Utilization Study for the Library.</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Burt Hill will consider the tasks, expertise required and work with DCAM to prepare a proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Shirley Dugdale, a Chicago based consultant is contributing to the Science Study. Burt Hill will look into what she does.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Beacon Architects 2008 study is limited to the building itself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The timing of the study is unclear but needs to be established to coordinate with the academic plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The study would include the Science Library collections (contact?). Jay Shafer is the DuBois Library director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pre Dean Meeting (2/23 or 27) with Jim Cahill is to update him on the project and process and lay out the expectations of the stack holders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The agenda was outlined in the conference call of 2/2. Burt Hill will put together a meeting agenda.</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Meeting with the Deans is targeted for 3/2 (or the week of 3/2?).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The 3 weeks for questionnaire response on Ann’s schedule would overlap with the proposed Department tours/interviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The department interview format must be very tight to stay on task and schedule. Discussions should stay focused on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Projections for future growth or change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Their location and relevant or desirable adjacencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Any limitations their current space puts on academic programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Need to limit “wish list” type of discussions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Science project schedules got off track and had to be revisited multiple times causing problems within the stack holder groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Maintaining focus can be greatly facilitated by advanced knowledge of the departments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Work Plan:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. BH will be meeting with Ann the week of 2/16 to advance the work plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Weekly Conference calls will be on Mondays from 11:00 to 12:30. Burt Hill will set up the line. There will not be a call on Presidents Day, 2/16/09.</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

11. Questionnaire: Susan and Ann agree that two questionnaires are needed. | |
| a. The idea of one questionnaire that filters to two user specific groups of questions will be reviewed by BH. | BH |
| b. Ludmilla has a general list of questions they have used for talking to | Lu |
c. Ludmilla mentioned a study for the School of Public Health which may be a good model. Ann and UMass will review.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

12. A reimbursable additional services budget sheet needs to be developed for tracking things like site surveys, geotechnical studies and special studies like the library.
   
a. Ann sent a sample during the meeting.
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/s/
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From: Joel E. Nordberg

February 23, 2009

Subject/Project Number:
New Academic Classroom Facilities
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Mass State Project: UMA0801 ST1
Burt Hill Project 08825.00

Meeting Number:  Meeting Date:  Project Phase:  Meeting Location:
18 February, 2009  Work Plan  UMass Amherst, F&CP

Meeting Purpose:
Review Departmental Information Gathering Process & Schedule

Attendees:  Distribution:
Ludmilla Paplova, Cleve Carrens – Umass
Ann Storer – DCAM
Joel Nordberg – Burt Hill
Ann Storer, Ludmilla
Pavlova, Susan Personette,
Alex Wing, Michael Reagan

Comments:  Action By/Due Date:

1. Departmental Tours and Interviews:
   a. Burt Hill had initially changed the work plan schedule to show combining tours
      with interviews (including key staff) in the department space. This was
      proposed to try to keep the interview/tours to within a schedule of 3 blocks
      over 3 active weeks.
   b. Upon further discussions with Ann, it was decided that moving between
      meetings would be unmanageable and too difficult to keep to a schedule.
   c. The follow-up plan was to schedule just blocks of tours followed by subsequent
      blocks of workshops with department heads and representatives in a later time
      block. This would allow the tours to start before the questionnaire responses
      were compiled.

2. UMass felt that this did not adequately engage the departments. The following
   alternatives were proposed.
   a. Building coordinators manage the department space in each building and
      would give access to all rooms. Coordinators generally are more available
      and could confirm who sits where.
   b. The tour would be followed immediately (or possibly be preceded) by a face to
      face meeting with the Department Chair (only) to get information about
      problems in the spaces, head counts, projected growth or changes, etc.
   c. Then there would be a subsequent set of workshop/interviews after the data
      had been compiled to confirm information. The follow-up meeting might only
      be at the College / Dean level with department heads brought in at intervals
or together. These would both be Information Gathering meetings.

d.

3. Administrative questionnaires:
   a. The Administrative questionnaire would only go out to Department Chairs.
   b. Ludmilla wanted to compile an alternative set of questionnaire questions.

4. Schedule:
   a. Tours and Department Chair meetings would be scheduled for March. The Deans meeting is scheduled for March 5th eliminating the first week of March. Avoiding spring break week (3/16 – 20), the middle of the week of 3/23 when Science meetings are scheduled, left only the weeks of the 9th and 30th.
   b. April is a very difficult month also due to Science workshops already scheduled and school vacations.
   c. Follow-up meeting/workshops would not be possible until May.
   d. UMass needs to provide information about the end of semesters and availability of faculty and staff for May as well as later in the summer when Potential Solution discussion would take place.

5. The classroom count is now at 356 according to UMass calculations.
   a. Reference the file MPG3052 on the Sharesite was made to the most current information.

6. Ann referenced the DCAM established benchmarks and standards. For classrooms 67% seat filled, 67% of the available hours in use.

7. Ann requested a summary schedule showing 3 tracks for the Comprehensive Academic Classroom Plan: 1) Classroom utilization plan; 2) Department utilization plan; and, 3) the certifiable building study.
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