

Report of the IU Northwest
Facilities Planning Committee
To the Strategic Planning Team
May 30, 2006

I. The 2005-2006 Facilities Planning Committee (FPC)

Approximately twenty-one persons constituted the FPC this year, including representatives from the faculty, staff, and administration. A list of FPC members is attached to this report as Appendix A.

II. FPC Guidelines and Goals, 2005-2006

FY2005-2006 saw the implementation of the first cyclical facilities planning process at IU Northwest. This process had been outlined in the report entitled, "Facilities Planning at Indiana University Northwest," authored by Joseph E. Bilotta in 2004 and approved by the Cabinet in 2005 (this document is known informally as the Bilotta Report).

At its first meeting, the FPC agreed that the Bilotta Report would serve to guide the work of the FPC, along with the Strategic Planning Team guiding principles (attached as Appendix B). The Committee also noted that the SPT principles would supersede the goals and objectives portion of the Bilotta Report.

In particular, the FPC stressed two important points found in the Bilotta Report. First, the Committee would strive, whenever possible, to place student-related departments and services in the central portion of campus, leaving the campus periphery to house administrative offices. Second, the FPC would consider all space requests together at one time to make the assignment of space as efficient and effective as possible, while still remaining flexible to address short-term "emergency" requests.

In addition, the Committee determined that the planning for newly vacated space resulting from units occupying Phase II of the new Medical/Professional building would serve as a major focus of the FPC's work in 2005-2006, along with discussions of an aesthetically significant building to house multidisciplinary and multidimensional programs and activities within our two Areas of Excellence.

III. The Process

Utilizing the foundational principles described above, the FPC began its work. This year was a learning experience for all involved, including the FPC, Deans, Directors, Vice Chancellors, and Cabinet. All requests for space on campus were to be sent to Deans and/or Vice Chancellors by November 15. This deadline was chosen, in part, because it followed the October 15 release of faculty positions for

which office space might be required. A new Facilities Request Form (Appendix C) was introduced and included signature lines for the space requestor, the Dean, and the Vice Chancellor. In this manner, the process followed a series of upward links. Once the Vice Chancellors had reviewed and signed off on the Forms (and, by implication, approving and supporting the requests), those papers were then sent to the interim chair of the FPC for the Committee's consideration. In this manner, all requests were submitted around the same time, thus allowing the FPC to meet its objective of studying all requests at once. The Committee received over thirty requests by November 15.

In January, the FPC met for an all-day session with Joseph Bilotta, to consider the requests, most of which sought space in newly-vacated areas made available with the move of Business, Nursing, SPEA, and Social Work to the new Medical/Professional building. Once the assignments were made, the interim chair of the FPC met with all requestors and their Dean and/or Vice Chancellor to discuss the FPC's suggestions and get feedback from the requestors. When all parties were satisfied, the requests went to the Cabinet. In this way, the Vice Chancellors were able to see space requests twice—once when signing the Facilities Request Form, and again during Cabinet deliberations on requests. After Cabinet approval, the FPC interim chair notified requestors of the Cabinet's action (see Appendix D for list of 2005-2006 facilities requests and outcomes).

While implementing this new process, the FPC simultaneously considered other facilities-related requests, such as new furniture for Moraine Student Center and new outdoor benches, tables, and trash containers for the campus' exterior. In addition, the Committee dealt with "emergency" space requests, such as finding space for the new Accounting director, and an office for the Weed and Seed Coordinator.

This year's process seemed to work well, although the FPC experienced a couple of problems with it, which will be described below. Because of the time demands of space allocation, the Committee wasn't able to discuss in-depth its second major objective of the year, i.e. an aesthetically significant building to house multidisciplinary and multidimensional programs and activities within our two Areas of Excellence. The FPC did, however, create a subcommittee to begin work on this very important goal.

IV. Problems, Concerns, and Suggestions

Communication—One of the problems encountered by the FPC was the apparent lack of knowledge of most requestors about the new process. As noted above, this year was a learning year for everyone, including Deans and Vice Chancellors. For example, as of this writing, the FPC interim chair has two facilities requests submitted in May. When the interim chair advised the requestors that their requests would be considered as part of the new cycle in Fall 2006, they

expressed surprise and dismay. As we enter a new facilities cycle on July 1, we would like Deans and Vice Chancellors to alert more often their faculty and staff about the new process and its deadline for facilities requests. The FPC interim chair will endeavor to communicate with Deans and Vice Chancellors early in the new cycle and ask them to notify their faculty and staff about the process. Another possibility is to ask Deans and Directors to include facilities needs in their annual reports.

Costs of Requests—A second problem arose concerning the costs of fulfilling a space request. While the process usually resulted in space assignments, there was little discussion of the cost of implementing a request, such as designing and modifying space and/or equipping new space. In short, planning and approving requests were one thing--funding those space requests was another. The FPC will be meeting in June to discuss the process and work in a component for funding, probably requiring a facilities request to include a cost estimate and source of funding.

Time/Attention/Commitment—Facilities planning and actions require continuous attention to detail and a significant time commitment. The FPC, while offering valuable insight and advice for facilities planning at IUN, cannot be fully effective without either a full-time professional planner or an institutional researcher heading the Committee. The FPC is grateful for the guidance provided by Joseph Bilotta and concurs with the Bilotta Report's recommendation that the FPC be chaired by a Director of Institutional Research.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen G. McShane
Interim Chair, Facilities Planning Committee