EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Space Planning met throughout the fall 2013 semester to review available information on use of lecture, laboratory, office, and research space in Academic Affairs and to provide recommended principles for the assignment and use of space. Space is a finite resource for California State University, Northridge because of a lack of capital investment by the State of California. When coupled with significant enrollment growth born of demand for access, consistent reductions in the General Fund budget, a call for increased research productivity, and efforts to improve scheduling efficiency, principles are needed to guide decision-makers to address expected growth.

The Committee analyzed available information, requested and reviewed additional reports, and surveyed faculty and students regarding space use, best practices, and priorities. As a result, the committee submits the following issues and recommendations to be addressed:

Classrooms: While CSUN typically meets or exceeds utilization standards established for the system, of the 238 lecture halls and classrooms, only 72% of the seat times are occupied. Moreover, percentage use varies significantly by time and location. It is suggested here that we need to be more efficient in allocating classes across buildings and across time frames (especially 8-9 a.m. and on weekends). Moreover, we need to look for alternatives to classroom venues such as in hybrid and online classes and examination for credit (SBE).

Labs: Of the 266 labs on campus, 107 are computer labs, of which 13 are open and 94 are “locked.” A total of 219 are instructional labs, including 60 that are computer labs. This maze of lab types leads to a lack of common definition in use and results in a historically proprietary sense of ownership. As the demand for software increases we should facilitate a broader selection of programs in myCSUNsoftware. Moreover, as the hours for use remain restricted (especially evenings and weekends), and the inventory of labs across departments continue to be proprietary, we recommend a new vocabulary (e.g. restricted vs. unrestricted instead of “locked” vs. “unlocked”) be instituted, while establishing a well distributed inventory of all labs (indicating times of occupancy and alternative times of vacancy) so as to foster better communication between departments and colleges, concerning their use.
Research Space: With the increasing expectation for securing grants and conducting research activities, there are concerns about more research, staff, and administrative space to carry out such endeavors. Accordingly, we recommend that a comprehensive inventory of all space on campus be conducted to identify labs that can be repurposed into shared and multipurpose space. Moreover, we suggest the university determine the feasibility of apportioning some grant overhead to informally provide funds for space. Additionally, we recommend that specific space for proposed research activities be identified prior to deans’ approval of grant proposals.

Office Space: There appears to be no formal policy for assigning faculty office space (or at best it is decentralized). Therefore, the committee recommends we identify and inventory offices, consult with faculty while optimizing the uses of such space, maintaining flexibility and collaboration as goals, all while being mindful of the particular needs of the various units on campus. Due to the diversity of programmatic and disciplinary needs, office space allocation should be handled foremost at the most local level with inventories to aid in ensuring efficiency and in recognition of the fact that all offices ultimately belong to the University. Policy needs to be developed for allocating space to part time, FERP, emeritus, and visiting faculty.

While we recognize these specific recommendations are advisory, it should be noted that they derive from general principles and practices, among which are that we recognize space of all types is limited, that we should strive to optimize and allocate with efficiency and flexibility, but that such decisions should be made in the context of collaboration and a sense of community.

That said, we conclude in recommending these central themes: (1) that space should be inventoried and continuously monitored and a common database be made available to all administrative units using standard definitions and terminology; (2) where practical, space should be shared across departments, colleges and administrative units; (3) alternative delivery methods and venues should be evaluated to expand space alternatives; (4) as much as possible, space should be flexible and multi-purposed; (5) existing space should be re-evaluated to conform to CSU standards; and (6) above all, affected faculty should be involved in the development of reallocation plans.
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COMMITTEE CHARGE AND COMPOSITION

Provost Harry Hellenbrand convened the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Space Planning on September 4, 2013 and provided the following charge:

The Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Space Planning will be convened in September 2013 and is charged with providing recommended principles for the assignment and use of lecture, laboratory, office, and administrative space in Academic Affairs. The Committee will use available information on lecture and lab utilization and may request special analyses of space assignments and use within the Division. The Committee will provide a report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs by the end of fall 2013 that includes principles to guide space use, allocation, and reallocation.

The Committee will be composed of nine faculty members (one from each of the eight colleges and the Library). Faculty members eligible to serve on the committee will be either assistant or associate professors with five to ten years of service. A committee chair will be appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs from among the senior faculty of the University. The Committee will be staffed by the Associate Vice President for Academic Resources and Planning.
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INTRODUCTION

PROCESS AND APPROACH

The Committee met approximately every two weeks throughout the fall 2013 semester. Agendas and minutes of the Committee meetings are available at http://csunorth.prod.acquia-sites.com/academic-resources/appendices. The Department of Academic Resources and Planning and others provided available reports for the Committee. Academic Affairs has progressively renovated spaces over the last several years and these efforts are highlighted in a report prepared in January 2013 (Appendix A). All reports, sources, and survey data are also available at http://csunorth.prod.acquia-sites.com/academic-resources/appendices.

The Committee recognizes that discussions about space use are sensitive and that any changes to space allocation will require a culture change on campus. The Committee encourages this change of culture from one of “ownership” of space to one of a “community.” Early topics discussed by the faculty members included:

- Research space vs. classroom space
- Difference between basic and applied research in terms of space needs
- Open space and locked space
- Different ways space is allocated
- Structural issues
- Dialogues and communications between deans, departments, and central offices that allocate space
- Budget and resources as a motivational tool with the faculty from the deans
- Policy issues
- Emphasize on student needs more than faculty needs

Members divided into several subcommittees to work on specific topics. These included: (1) classrooms (Esparza, Schutte), (2) laboratories (Bowen, Hansen, Rutrick), (3) research space (Heermance, Knotts), (4) faculty offices (Paik, Swenson), and (5) surveys (Gandhi, Rutrick). The subcommittees met separately and reconvened in the larger Committee meetings every two weeks.
SURVEYS

The Committee decided to administer two short surveys (Appendix B), one to students and the other to faculty. Information from the surveys is included in the sections of this report.

CLASSROOMS

This section takes a critical look at the current state of enrollment and classroom utilization, both by total university and by college, together with recommendations for optimizing existing space and for "inventing" new space, while drawing conclusions about alternatives and their ability to solve the enrollment dilemma. We do so with the understanding that there are a total of 354 classrooms and labs; we are concerned with the 238 that are lecture halls and classrooms (Appendix C: Lecture Room Inventory).

CURRENT ENROLLMENT

Current fall 2013 FTES enrollment is at 31,269 or roughly 5.5% over target. With estimates for spring 2014 blended in, the overage for 2013/14 is likely to be 7.2%, despite closing freshmen and transfer student enrollment in the spring, and despite the fact that average unit load has slowly crept up to nearly 12.1 units. One could argue that this is largely a function of a record freshman class that includes enrollment of 5,818 first time freshman this year, nearly 1,300 above expectations and, therefore, constitutes an “outlier,” in statistical terms.

However, in looking at enrollment figures for the past two decades, there has been a steady but increasing headcount from 1993 to 2013 of 14.6% (i.e. 33,426 in 1993 to 38310 in 2013). More recently, there is clearly a positive trend year over year (e.g., 2012 FTES enrollment at 29,181 vs. 2013 FTES enrollment at 31,269, representing a 7% increase year over year). Thus, it is clear that we have a rising demand in enrollment. Yet the number of classrooms has reached a limit, with little or no perceived influx of capital from the state or private concerns that would portend an increasing supply. The remainder of this section looks at the issues and recommendations resulting from this dilemma.

CLASSROOM UTILIZATION ISSUES

Part of the challenge of analyzing use statistics is that the benchmark currently used by the Chancellor’s Office starts with a threshold that is arguably much lower than actual capacity and thus we are lulled into thinking we meet or exceed standards. However, this analysis takes count of the total seat hours and the actual enrollment during those hours to calculate a metric of
“capacity.” The results follow. (See Appendix D: Fall 2013 Vacant Rooms Analysis and Appendix E: Fall 2013 Room Hour Utilization Special Report for Fall 2013 data used in this analysis. See Appendix F: Room Utilization Report 2012/13).

- If the supply of classrooms and lecture halls was simply a function of disparate allocation across colleges, we could expect to see that the number of seats across classrooms totaled by time frame surpasses current enrollment and expectation for future enrollment. While that is true for current enrollment, it is not for future capacity. For example, today the number of seats in the 354 classrooms and labs on campus totals 169,464. With 31,269 FTES carrying an average of 12.1 units, to the naïve observer, simple math would indicate 31,288 x (12.3 / 3 = 4.034 classes per student) would come to 126,215 seats used per day. Using our metric, that would indicate an approximate 74.4% utilization of all seat times in all classrooms/labs. Indeed, that is the approximate utilization reported by SOLAR (i.e. 125,513/169,454 = 74%). All other things being equal, therefore, it would appear we could support another 35% increase in enrollment to 42,281 FTES (i.e., 26%/74% = 35%), if all seats were occupied at all time.

- However, all things are not equal and, therefore, like unemployment rates, not all people can be employed all the time and not all seats can be occupied at all times. Moreover, classrooms and labs do not have the same use patterns. Therefore, we must look at classrooms independent of labs. If so, the overall capacity of classrooms is based on 238 rooms or 69% of the total rooms but, of course, because lecture rooms are on average bigger than labs, the 152,808 seats represent 90% of the total seats. Yet despite being 90% of the seats, their utilization constitutes slightly less than the total utilization when compared to the labs (111,592 out of 152,808 or 72%). That means that while classrooms utilize 72% of the seats, labs occupy 90% of their seats. Clearly classrooms are more under-utilized than labs.

- What constitutes the 28% vacancy in classroom seat times? And is that number a constant or can we tweak classroom assignments to increase utilization? The answer is two-fold. First, we must look at the time of classes and second, we must look at the type and location of classrooms. With regard to the first issue, it is clear that classroom
utilization varies by time. Indeed, a cursory look at the morning, afternoon, and evening schedule shows that 44% of all classes (i.e., 1,201 courses) are scheduled in the morning, 45% (or 1,312 courses) in the afternoon and only 15% (or 450 courses) in the evenings. Yet while 45% of the classes are held in the time frame 8:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m., fewer courses are scheduled from 7:00-9:00 a.m. than entirely scheduled in the evening (i.e., less than 450). Students responding to the survey preferred 8 a.m. classes over weekend classes nearly three to two (i.e., 62% versus 42%).

- Moreover, classroom utilization varies significantly by location and time. For example, while Education is particularly suited for evening classes, ED1117, 1121, 1122, 1125 and 1126 are used an average of 48% capacity in the evenings. This may be a function of the current enrollment challenges of the College. However, interestingly, faculty in Education who responded to the survey indicated that general classroom space was their main concern. Yet BH304, 310, 313, and 315 classrooms average less than 10% evening utilization. Nor are morning hours maximized. SG 108, 109 and 110 operate at or less than 50% of capacity in the morning hours. Clearly, we need to formulate a procedure that optimizes the allocation space by time and location. (See Appendix E for details on variation by classroom and hours).

- Yet, as much as we can debate the threshold for the maximum percentage utilization of classrooms during traditional times and venues, we must evaluate times and locations outside the box. For example, the above analysis describes weekday utilization only. If we look at weekends, we see that only 146 courses are scheduled (all but one of which are on Saturday). This translates into an enrollment of 4,820 or 3.2% of the total seat capacity. While a majority (58%) of student respondents in our survey does not want more weekend classes scheduled, the survey data did demonstrate there is significant number of students (48% or 42%?) that do want more weekend classes.
RECOMMENDATIONS

• First, it is obvious that we need to optimize the allocation of courses by time, day, and location. By balancing the use of individual classrooms, across buildings, while increasing the number of 8:00-9:00 a.m. and evening courses, we can likely absorb a 10-15% increase in enrollment. That solution, however, would take us out less than two to three years of increased enrollment. Yet, by fully supporting weekend courses, we can absorb an additional 20% enrollment that would take care of another five year enrollment increase. In short, by perfecting these sources, we could absorb 30-35% increase over the next five years. However, to go much beyond 40,000 FTES, we need to entertain alternatives.

• Beyond optimization, we need to look at two other sources of increasing the supply of classrooms. The first is the potential for “new” classroom space. There are three possible sources of new classroom space. These include the utilization of larger lecture halls, in the context of “complimentary scheduling,” thereby doubling the number of seats used per classroom. Second, we can cross-purpose labs with classroom techniques such as “flipping the classroom” to do away with additional class lecture time. And third, we can identify existing and new sources of classroom space such as the second floor of the Bookstore complex, the eight classrooms planned for the new Tseng College Building, and even new off campus venues such as the North Campus Development. In total, these three elements could provide a significant cushion for additional enrollment.

• Second, we must look at alternatives to the physical classroom. Clearly increasing online courses is one possibility. This has the potential of facilitating 10-20% additional enrollment. (See Appendix G: Fall 2013 Online/Hybrid Analysis for details). However, we must be diligent in evaluating this method as it is prone to taking the form of a fad (witness the rise and fall of MOOCs). Alternatively, we could ratchet up the use of Satisfaction by Examination (SBE), where the physical classroom is substituted with online testing. If fully implemented, it could absorb another 10% enrollment. Like online classes, however, this would involve some upfront efforts and costs, but could
substantially increase enrollment potential. Finally, we could increase the effectiveness of S-factor courses by inverting the point of contact, whereby the professor could manage two to three field supervisors and hold meetings with multiple sections (since typically these courses have similar instructors but different meeting times). This could easily reduce enrollment demand for meeting space, while leaving many important S-factor courses in place.

- Finally, while we have focused heretofore on facilities, clearly the other method for balancing supply and demand is to limit enrollment. This could be done by (1) limiting classes (not the best of the alternatives), (2) declaring the campus as impacted, or (3) moving to limit the scope of the Tier I “local” enrollment area.

While this leaves much food for thought with respect to classrooms and lecture halls vs. enrollment, it is but only one dimension of the problem. Therefore, we now turn our attention to the capacity and utilization of labs.

**TEACHING AND INSTRUCTIONAL LABORATORIES**

Like every other space on campus, teaching and instructional/activity labs appear to be in high demand. That is not expected to change in the future. In fact, the move to mobile technology, such as the use of laptops and tablets in teaching and learning, coupled with the desire for more collaborative and interdisciplinary programs and projects, is expected to dramatically increase the need for these types of work spaces.

Right now, about 266 labs (Appendix H) exist in Academic Affairs (Table 1) in support of instruction. (This excludes research spaces, detailed in the next section of this report, which are not used for scheduled instruction.) Not quite half—107—are computer labs (Appendix I), 13 of which are considered “open” for use by all students, with the remaining 94 computer labs “locked” for specialized use within departments and colleges. Six of the 13 open computer labs are physically in the Library. Some of the computer labs also serve as lecture/lab or lab/classroom combination rooms. Of the 266 labs, 219 instructional labs (60 of which are computer labs) hold regularly-scheduled sections (Table 1).
Some difficulty exists in the lack of an effective definition for these spaces. For example, “open” does not mean that any student has free access to the space. “Locked” typically means that the lab is specific to a department and/or college; as these spaces are so attached to a particular major or discipline, there is little opportunity for sharing and/or collaboration. Within colleges, the existence and use of these spaces is more often determined by department history, discipline-specific pedagogy and, sometimes, long-standing territorial practices rather than overarching policy.

With anticipated enrollment growth and swiftly changing teaching and learning practices driven by technology comes the need for a vision. Perhaps this should start at the college level, with discussions about how these spaces could be used more efficiently in the future. At the very least, the university can begin using this information in facilities and Academic Affairs planning.

This committee, mindful of the sometimes-sensitive issues surrounding departmental and pedagogical concerns related to teaching and instructional labs, identified a series of issues and concerns. A second list follows, with a series of recommendations or best practices that might later form the basis of campus-wide guidelines and policies.
ISSUES/CONCERNS

- Although the number of students bringing laptops will likely rise over time (Appendix J), the expected maximum proportion of students who bring laptops is limited, due to financial and security concerns, and thus the need for computer-equipped labs will remain.

- Some discipline-specific software (such as Pearson’s lab for math homework) is not available through myCSUNsoftware, student purchase, or in general labs. Students will need to use department-specific labs and related instructional space.

- Many department-specific labs are closed during the evening and weekends and faculty are not always clear when or who to contact (IT or FTC) for assistance.

- No network exists to identify labs across departments and colleges that might be available and thus more efficiently utilized by faculty and students.

- There is also a lack of collaborative space for faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS/BEST PRACTICES

- The mandate to reduce the total number of computers should be quantified and time-bound. This should not be affected by reducing the number of labs. (The survey of student concerns about labs was not conclusive (Appendix B).)

- Replace the terms “locked”/”unlocked” with “restricted” / “unrestricted.” A new class of restricted – “protected” – should apply to those labs that (independent of utilization) can only ever be used by a specific department or college. For example, this would apply to instructional spaces, such as the TV and film production studios in CAMC and the Department of Geography Map Library.

- With respect to “restricted” but not “protected” labs, departments/colleges should be encouraged to evaluate lab usage according to need, not history. In other words, labs that are restricted but not protected should be subject to review. If utilization metrics show
that they are significantly under capacity, the labs would revert to unrestricted status and made available for sharing and/or collaborative projects with other departments/colleges.

- A system should be implemented whereby teaching and instructional labs are inventoried each semester. This would enable the creation of a searchable database for faculty and students to use to determine any free space. That is, a student could search for a lab that is available at a given time that has specific software. For example: The University of Houston Libraries has mapped all of its computers and equipment. Students can check the availability of computers and equipment through a web site link where they can then login to the library and reserve a computer or piece of equipment.

- The use of a printed posted schedule would be helpful to indicate when classes are taught, faculty name and contact information, and if/when the labs/classrooms are open for other use and by whom. These data would be part of the aforementioned database. For example:

  **ED 1126**  
  ENGL 101 8am-9:15am Professor Jones. [prof.jones@csun.edu](mailto:prof.jones@csun.edu) x555X  
  GEOL 150 9:30-10:45am Professor Smith. [prof.smith@csun.edu](mailto:prof.smith@csun.edu) x555X  
  10:45am – 12:00pm open lab for English majors  
  IT support email address/phone number including after hours  
  Point person for any other concerns (department or college level)

- The university should create collaborative and/or interdisciplinary project spaces where possible, such as within a college, by developing community-building incentives or mutually beneficial partnerships among departments, faculty, and students.

- Also, where possible, create flexible/reconfigurable environments (Appendices K and L) to leverage the existing labs for multiple uses, including as fixed, collaborative, open lab space. This would mean deploying modular and/or reconfigurable furniture to facilitate these spaces.
• An additional recommendation to foster interdisciplinary collaborations includes the development of at least one truly open lab in each college, where students can work on class assignments and projects.

• Where possible, upgrade the available technology across campus, so that students have access to a wide variety of cloud-based technology and software no matter where they are working on campus.

RESEARCH SPACE

CSUN has increased its research activities and has goals to continue to do so. Historical research activity is outlined in Appendix M. The University’s research potential is directly linked to the quality of the research facilities (Appendix N) on campus. As the University wishes to increase research on campus, the research space should be either increased or the existing space modified to accommodate this growth. Here we provide recommendations for future scenarios related to research space at CSUN.

ISSUES/CONCERNS

The following concerns arise as the University wishes to support faculty research:

• Shortage of research lab space available for new hires, particularly in science and technology disciplines.

• Paucity of available office space for researchers (i.e., postdoctoral researchers, graduate students) that facilitate productivity and proposal writing.

• New research will require administrative space available for administrative staff for funded grants.

• The apparent attitude of “use it or lose it” creates a culture of space hoarding where current faculty and/or administrators see space as “owned” and are unlikely to be open to sharing or re-allocation of space.
RECOMMENDATIONS

• REPURPOSED SPACE: An inventory of lab space should be undertaken at the College and/or University level to include “single-use labs” versus “multi-use labs,” research labs versus teaching labs – a percentage goal of funding sources for “naming rights” of labs should be established after the inventory is completed. Although research space varies by discipline, there may be incentive for “shared” research spaces if these spaces have technical support provided by the university. For example, a shared wet-chemistry lab with a full-time tech could be utilized by three to four faculty as opposed to individual labs with no technical support. These “shared” labs would have higher throughput. This addresses University Goals: Faculty Satisfaction and Sustainability.

• OVERHEAD: As research investment increases, it follows that total overhead should increase as well. Although at present much of the overhead funds are returned to the researchers via the “Large Grants Policy,” we feel that a portion of the total overhead funds should be set aside for space renovation at the discretion of each college. The university could consider raising the total overhead rate to accommodate this new fund, as the current rates are lower, in some cases, than similar institutions. This addresses University Goals: Faculty Satisfaction, New Funding Sources, and Visibility.

• SQUARE FOOTAGE INVENTORY: A quantitative evaluation of the research lab and office needs per department or College should be undertaken on campus. This should include both faculty wishes and a look at existing faculty office and research space – a research space allocation/goal should be established within each college or discipline as a benchmark for future hires and to create transparency for space allocation across campus. This addresses University Goals: Faculty Satisfaction and Sustainability.

• REALLOCATION OF EXISTING LAB SPACE: Space reallocation is bound to be a sensitive issue, but a necessary step for improving space efficiency. Based on the square-footage inventory recommended above, every effort should be made to accommodate the space desires (as realistically feasible) for existing faculty. Space reallocation should be encouraged on a college-level. This addresses University Goals: Sustainability.
SPACE ALLOCATION FOR GRANTS: Any grant proposal should include a specific discussion concerning the space requirements for the grant. We recommend that a section be added to the existing “Grant Data Form” that explains what space will be required or how space will be funded within the parameters of the grant. This addresses University Goals: Faculty Satisfaction and Sustainability.

FACULTY OFFICES

This section is developed to provide principles for the assignment and use of faculty office spaces. Faculty office spaces are limited university resources that should be managed in an efficient and effective manner. Faculty office spaces are also provided to support the faculty’s academic, administrative, and service needs. The number of faculty members is expected to continue growing. However, little or no state funding for significant expansion of the physical plant is expected. Thus, faculty office spaces are increasingly limited. At the same time, units have an interest in retaining the spaces that have been assigned to them when those spaces are no longer being used. This sense of ownership may make faculty space assignment and use more difficult to manage. Therefore, it is essential to establish rational principles to make reasonable decisions regarding the assignment and use of faculty office spaces.

FINDINGS

The only general guideline governing office space assignment that the committee is aware of is from the CSU system. According to SUAM 9065.01ff (http://www.calstate.edu/cpdc/suam/SUAM9060-9079.pdf) one stand-alone office with the 110 ASF (Assignable Square Footage) is provided for each full-time equivalent faculty. This guideline seems to pertain primarily to new construction. The extent to which this constrains use of existing space is unclear.

Table 2 shows the current total inventory of faculty offices with currently-employed equivalents (FTEF) of full-time (FT) faculty, part-time (PT) faculty, and others, including teaching associates and graduate assistants (Appendix O). However, even at this level of aggregation, the data show some ambiguity, imperfection, and variation. The assignable square footage (ASF) attributed to offices includes shared spaces and suites, oversized rooms, and
several programmatic anomalies such as studio spaces and offices in research labs that might more appropriately be considered as part of research space considerations. The variation in space assignments is clear from the ranges of ASF/Room and ASF/FTEF. Outlying figures correlate with very small programs and larger programs that heavily use “other” instructors ([http://w1pre.csun.edu/academic-resources/appendices](http://w1pre.csun.edu/academic-resources/appendices)). The unclear nature of data can propagate in unhelpful ways at more detailed levels of analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of rooms</th>
<th>ASF</th>
<th>Average ASF / Room</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total FTEF</th>
<th># Rooms/FTEF</th>
<th>Average ASF/FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>147,294</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>103.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Other faculty includes TA and GA  
2 Incomplete ASF information  
3 includes shared spaces/suites and oversize rooms (e.g. Sierra Tower)  

NOTE: Other anomalies related to studio, offices in labs, shared part-time faculty spaces, etc. included in office data from SFDB

**Table 2. Fall 2013 Faculty Offices and Full-Time Equivalent Faculty**

There does not seem to be any formal written document regarding the principles for assigning faculty space at the university level. However, there may be items in past minutes of Provost’s Council which guide some office space decision-making. If so, these should be codified. An example is the requirement that offices assigned to those participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) be shared when not in use, particularly in cases where the assignment is for one term per year. Some colleges and departments may have such documents. If such a document exists at a responsible unit level, its existence might not have been widely recognized by many faculty of the unit and its application might have been limited.

Thus, in general, the current faculty space assignment process is decentralized. Colleges and departments presumably employ different procedures in assigning space to their faculty. There also appear to be inequalities in assignable square feet (ASF) of office space both within and across units, which may negatively affect faculty productivity or morale. Anecdotes of inefficient space-use are common, though presently unquantified. For example, reports abound
of faculty with administrative assignments retaining an unused office.

In an effort to effectively use available space, several colleges have worked over recent years to create shared spaces for part-time faculty. This practice has most recently included creation of suites with lockers and unassigned workspaces within a large room (e.g., Laurel Hall and Nordhoff Hall).

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Departures from the current practices of space assignment and use should be carefully conducted with clearly articulated objectives and guidelines. These must be developed with faculty input and feedback, and with attention to other faculty contractual agreements.

- Faculty spaces are University property; their allocation must ultimately serve the University’s strategic priorities. The myriad disciplines on campus entail that departments and colleges may have significantly different needs with respect to office space. Faculty office space allocations thus should be made with attention to the unit’s needs and the strategic priorities of the University.

- Faculty office spaces are limited University resources. They should be managed in an optimal way. All spaces should be used to maximum functionality and efficiency. Each responsible unit should make sure that all spaces are fully utilized. When offices are left unoccupied for a significant amount of time, such spaces can be used to address other space needs within the unit.

- To ensure the optimal assignment and use of faculty office spaces, each responsible unit finds a way to identify space requirements, solicit faculty feedback or involve faculty in planning and implementing office assignment and use, and establish clear guidelines and procedures for all office assignment.

- Flexibility needs to be properly maintained. No unit owns the faculty office spaces that have been assigned to it. A unit should try to handle new space needs from within the spaces that have been assigned to it. When there is no permanent need for the spaces that have been
assigned to a Department, the spaces go back to the College. When there is no permanent need for the spaces that have been assigned to a College, the spaces go back to the University space pool. Unused office spaces that have been allocated to a unit can be reassigned to another unit when university priorities demand, provided that the potentially differing needs of the units are considered and that the need cannot be met from the unit’s existing space allocation.

- When assigning faculty office spaces, the responsible unit tries to assign offices to foster collaboration within a department. Moreover, it is often valuable for students to be able to go to a determinate place and potentially find someone from the department to help them with an administrative or topical question. This collocation principle that faculty offices should be clustered by department constrains allocation. But it is intended to facilitate information sharing and cooperation amongst faculty, and to promote students’ access to faculty.

- It is essential to ensure the accuracy of faculty space inventory in terms of the total number of faculty spaces. An annual periodic audit is necessary to address the changing space issues in a timely manner. Based on this audit, each unit should maintain the annual official space inventory report that records all of the space allocations.

- It is necessary to develop the recommended office sizes and types for all specific faculty categories. Benchmarking can be used to establish the guideline. This guideline will be useful in planning the office spaces of future buildings and renovations of existing structures. When issues of square footage in allocation arise, they should be approached with something like Rawls’ Difference Principle: Within each category, faculty members should be assigned equal space; inequalities in space may be permitted provided they serve pedagogical ends.

- Guidelines for the assignment of office space to FERP faculty, visiting scholars/professors, and emeritus/retired faculty should be developed and codified.

- Among lecturers, shared spaces and open office arrangements can be considered whenever possible to efficiently use the limited spaces. Guidelines and best practices should be
developed to aid chairs in scheduling office use and resolving conflicts.

- Full-time faculty should normally have private offices. However, there may be some disciplines in which office space can productively be shared. Input should be solicited from full-time faculty members to identify such opportunities. Where opportunities exist, plans for the development and layout of the shared space should be developed in concert with the affected faculty members.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of these analyses, the committee has come to understand certain principles by which space allocation should be addressed and from these principals the committee has evolved a list of recommendations in the form of a list of best practices. Herein are those conclusions:

PRINCIPLES

The Committee has generated guiding principles as a result of its work. These are:

- Space is a finite resource and should be used efficiently and effectively.

- New classroom space should be made available and current space use should be maximized to meet enrollment growth demand.

- Spaces should be shared to support interdisciplinary instruction and research.

- All types of space on campus should be categorized accurately and a common data set should be maintained centrally. Space categories should accurately reflect space use.

- Spaces should allow for flexible and reconfigurable use.

- Those affected by changes in space use should be consulted.
BEST PRACTICES/RECOMMENDATIONS

Best practices and recommendations identified by the Committee include:

- Unused or underutilized spaces should be inventoried for potential reassignment for other use. A common system should be maintained centrally, updated regularly, and used to audit use of all types of spaces on a regular basis. (Research space, in particular, is not well classified, making it difficult to allocate and reallocate effectively.)

- Where practical, space should be shared across disciplines. This is true for classrooms, laboratories, research spaces, and, potentially, faculty offices and may require incentives to support inter- and trans-disciplinary work.

- Alternative time, delivery formats and venues should continue to be used to improve utilization and provide opportunities to expand use of existing space.

- Use the schedule optimization features as they are tested in the new room scheduling software (“EMS”) to recommend more efficient use of classrooms by time, day, and location.

- New (and renovated) spaces should be flexible and contain reconfigurable furniture. Consider reclassifying instructional laboratory spaces as restricted, unrestricted, and protected.

- Clarify the mandate to reduce numbers of computer labs and computers with a specific time-bound goal.

- Create a system (whether printed or electronic) to “post” times computer labs are available for open use.
• Expand software and infrastructure to support ubiquitous use of technology by students throughout the campus.

• The Grant Data Form should be modified to ensure space to support sponsored research is determined before a grant proposal is submitted to a granting agency.

• Expand the practice of creating shared office spaces and suites for lecturers, teaching associates, and graduate assistants.

• Continue the practice of collocating faculty within department zones, to the extent possible, for effective communication, cooperative work among faculty, and student interaction.

• Investigate feasibility of reducing Sierra Tower faculty office spaces to standard size.
APPENDICES

For all appendices see: http://csunorth.prod.acquia-sites.com/academic-resources/appendices