November 6, 2006

To: Provost Subbaswamy

From: Bob Wiseman
       Wayne Ritchie

Subject: ad hoc Facilities Planning Report

On May 1, 2006, you established an ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee to assess the short term needs for undergraduate teaching facilities as enrollment expands. You asked the group to look closely at the current through 2012 time frame, and then more generally at the remaining years addressed by The Top 20 Business Plan. You also asked the group to look at housing, dining, and parking. After an initial look at these four areas, the committee elected to briefly look at all “student support” offices to identify any major space issues. So the committee solicited input from the 16 college student support offices and from 20 campus-wide support offices.

Your charge to the committee went on to include the necessary revisions in the campus Physical Development Master Plan and the development of a list of related capital projects to be included in the institution’s capital planning. Work has already begun on capital plan projects. The update of the Master Plan is prepared to start following discussions of capital projects and your review of this report.

The members of the committee are: Pete Gilbert, Phil Kraemer, David Mohney, John Pica, Wayne Ritchie (co-chair), Joseph Sottile, Jr., Patricia Terrell, and Bob Wiseman (co-chair). Elizabeth Baker audited the meetings.

The change in the Associate Provost office delayed the start of the committee’s work. The committee met weekly during July and August. Each member of the committee brought helpful knowledge and experience to the table. Consistent with the charge, the committee spent a lot of time reviewing and discussing instructional space utilization data. Guest speakers were invited from certain support offices. Time did not permit presentations from all but written narratives were obtained from all. To deal with the voluminous information, the committee summarized several of the narratives and recommendation statements submitted. The full text of these informative submittals are in the appendix. The committee is
still reviewing the numerous recommendations it received and may later accept some as committee recommendations.

Enclosed please find the committee's report responding to the first part of its 3-part charge. The committee would be pleased to meet with you and discuss the report after you have had a chance to read it. We will keep the report confidential until you are comfortable sharing it.

cc: Pete Gilbert
    Phil Kraemer
    David Mohney
    John Pica
    Joseph Sottile, Jr.
    Patricia Terrell
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Executive Summary

Committee’s Charge

The charge of the ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee involved:

1. Assessing the short term capacity of instructional spaces in light of the planned enrollment increases, as well as housing, dining and parking
2. Identify facility projects to be included in the institution's capital plan
3. Implementing the update in the campus Physical Development Plan

This report responds to part 1 of the charge and covers additional support services. Part 2 is being developed separately and is in process. Part 3 is ready for implementation pending approval of parts 1 and 2.

Committee’s Approach

This report is intended to provide a “20,000 foot elevation” perspective, though it does provide several recommendations and detail in some areas. In addition to the Top 20 Business Plan Growth Targets, the committee began its work with a spreadsheet estimating the projected undergrad student numbers by class for each year leading up to 2020. That spreadsheet and its assumptions are contained herein. In maintaining this high elevation perspective, the committee identified the need for three follow-up groups for closer study.

Report

The report is arranged in four sections: executive summary, findings, recommendations, and appendix. The “Findings” section allocates one page to each topic so many are summaries of original submittals. Recommendations appear on these one page narratives but not all were adopted by committee. Recommendations adopted so far by the committee are found in the “Recommendations” sections. The “Appendix” is bound separately and contains the full text of all original submittals and presentations.

Findings

The committee’s findings are grouped as follows:

1. Instructional and research spaces
2. Instructional norms
3. Space for additional positions
4. Housing
5. Dining
6. Parking
7. Near term space opportunities
8. 2006 – 2012 space construction needs
9. Community facilities required for UK growth
10. College student service offices
11. Campus-wide service offices
There are opportunities to increase the utilization of current instructional spaces (classrooms and class labs) to accommodate the additional classes during 06-09. However an additional class lab for Chemistry and one for Biology will be needed soon, as will additional rooms seating over 150. Improvements in classroom scheduling methods will be needed by fall 2007. Instructional space equal to 126% of a White Hall Classroom Building will be needed by 2020. Research space expansion is extremely limited and will require costly space conversions until new buildings come on line. To accommodate research growth for 2020, nine (9) buildings equivalent to BBSRB will be needed.

The ability to accommodate additional classes within current instructional space can also be enhanced through the review and adjustment of established norms that define the class day and class week and impact class scheduling flexibility. These norms and established practices developed during times of steady enrollment and space construction and warrant reconsideration for the different environment ahead. An extension of the class day is envisioned to be necessary fall 2008.

Space for additional faculty, full-time instructors, part-time instructors, and teaching assistants is also very limited and will call for utilization assessments, renovations, and domino relocations involving off campus space. Very costly space upgrades and use conversions will be required, especially for research space within current buildings. Some staff will not be ideally located on campus near their home department.

The need for additional on-campus housing beds will grow but the ability to finance their construction will be a problem. Considerable funding is also needed for the upgrade of the old dorms. Privatization of the construction of dorms on campus will hopefully provide a solution. In the meantime, a couple of steps can be taken to make more beds available to freshmen.

There is growth capacity in the current dining service. Adjustments in meal plans and menus will continue in response to student wishes. Renovations of the current food service facilities remains a priority for Dining.

Parking will continue to be a problem. The increasing population on campus and the loss of surface lot parking to new building construction will only make the problem worse. Parking fees increases and debt service are deterrents to new parking garages. Alternate methods of campus access warrant LFUCG partnership.

There are some shelled spaces on campus that can be fit-up fairly quickly as office or teaching space. There are also some moderate cost consolidation projects that would free up space. Relocating some business functions to houses adjacent to campus or into leased/purchased space in Lexington can also provide some near term space relief. And lastly, renovation funding can make some unusable spaces available or make other spaces multi-purpose.
The committee’s findings and experiences are informing the 08-14 capital planning process currently underway, and is also defining space related work to be done outside the capital plan process. The capital plan contains projects to provide various types of spaces as will be needed. But the time required to be granted state project authority followed by years of design and construction activity indicates the critical importance of the current capital planning cycle.

As the university plans for the construction of new buildings to support its growth, it will very likely run into a roadblock in about two years. The city sewer will not have the capacity to accept additional buildings. The university must begin collaborative planning with the city and be preparing to bear some of the capacity cost.

The committee solicited feedback from the 16 college student support offices. Each envisions varying space and staff needs as they prepare for a larger and more diverse enrollment. Concerns included the number of faculty advisors and the special service needs of culturally-diverse students and students on probation. Additional funding, staffing and space will be needed in proportion to growth.

Perspectives on enrollment were gathered from twenty-one (21) campus-wide support offices/programs. These included housing, dining, and parking as included in the committee’s charge. The written narratives from the additional eighteen offices gave the committee a broader understanding of enrollment impacts outside the classroom. In some cases, the need for these offices to expand will increase the competition for on-campus space. Several of these offices impact recruitment and retention.

**Recommendations (short version)**
Not in priority order

1. Begin space planning immediately, followed by space renovation, to create an additional introductory Chemistry class lab for the fall 2008 semester, under the assumption that 07-08 enrollment stays at 4,000.

2. Immediately commission a space re-programming study of the Chemistry-Physics Building to identify methods of accommodating chemistry growth within current space.

3. Immediately convene the Committee on Effective Instructional Space Utilization to identify issues and opportunities to accommodate increased enrollment within current instructional space. See also #9 and #11.

4. Fit up the shelled classroom in the basement of the Wethington Building as soon as possible but not later than fall 2009. Begin now by hiring a consultant to complete the design and prepare a detailed cost estimate.
5. Preserve the two auditoriums in the current Pharmacy Building for shared classroom use in any modifications to accommodate Biology.

6. Make available at least one assembly room, seating over 150 but not historically used for classes, for one class per day beginning 07-08.

7. Direct the Physical Development Plan update to identify sites for additional 150 seat (minimum) lecture halls.

8. Create an additional Biology class lab by fall 2009, continue evening classes in introductory Biology, and prepare the vacated Pharmacy Bldg for Biology’s growth needs.

9. Appoint a Task Force to study and recommend changes in established norms regarding the instructional week. See also #3 and #11.

10. Regularly provide data regarding projected vs actual student numbers and student flow to university offices directly impacted by enrollment.

11. Utilize technology in creative ways, similar to distance learning, to reduce dependence on classroom and class lab space. See also #3 and #9.

12. Approve the ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee to proceed with the remaining elements of its original charge, upon satisfactory acceptance of this report.

13. Issue a written resolution, from the Provost, regarding space and its utilization.

14. Support Housing in their exploration of alternate financing plan, including privatization.

15. Request state authority for housing construction via the capital plan.

16. Limit the number of beds available to upper classmen but do maintain some upper classmen beds on campus.

17. Limit the beds available to BCTCS to 113 beds.

18. Support Dining as they develop new partnerships with colleges and units for small eateries across campus.

19. Support Dining as they continue their plans to update and renovate dining facilities.

20. Encourage Dining to include a new central campus facility in their growth plans.
21. Utilize the upcoming update of the Campus Master Plan to begin to address parking needs and alternates to campus access.

22. Begin an assessment process to identify certain programs and functions as candidates for relocation to space off-campus.

23. Begin financial and space planning immediately to fit up shelled spaces on campus to alleviate high priority space needs.

24. Direct financial and space assignment planning to address existing spaces which can not be adequately utilized until improvements are made.

25. Expand the efforts of the Provost Office of Resource Management in assisting programs with space use alternatives and in identifying resources needed to expand functions within current space.

26. Allocate considerable funds through budgetary planning for converting and upgrading space to meet higher level uses, especially research use.

27. Maintain the centralization of student support offices and services as an institutional goal and continue movement in that direction.

28. Continue the Science and Engineering Library consolidation and move forward with institutional financial support.

29. Utilize university capital planning and funding to yield the additional space needed for growth.

30. Give consideration to capital projects with “2-for-1 space benefits” in the upcoming capital planning cycle.

31. Give consideration to building acquisitions adjacent to campus or in the Lexington area.

32. Direct all new campus building projects to respond to institutional space needs, in addition to those of the occupant, even if the project is privately funded.

33. Initiate discussions with other university leaders to encourage the use of faster and more economical types of construction to accelerate physical growth within limited dollars.

34. Co-fund an engineering analysis of the city sewer with LFUCG, increase awareness of the sewer problem among community leadership and prepare to fund a sewer construction assessment.
35. Establish a Task Force to develop a research facilities growth plan which responds to projected growth in the various disciplines.

36. Prepare institutional resource allocation to be responsive to the needs of the college student support offices.

37. Consider the impacts of enrollment expansion on the many campus-wide services offices in planning and implementation.
Estimates of Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fresh</th>
<th>Soph</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Other (Non-degree)</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Increment Over Previous Year</th>
<th>Increment Over Baseline Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Increment Goal</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Difference between Total and Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Retention Rate</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>127%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Reten/Grad Rate</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>3596</td>
<td>3506</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16595</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>18492</td>
<td>19118</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>18967</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>5140</td>
<td>3776</td>
<td>3643</td>
<td>4445</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17050</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>18732</td>
<td>19913</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>19403</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>4185</td>
<td>4099</td>
<td>4845</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18439</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>20039</td>
<td>20409</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>19037</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>5390</td>
<td>4324</td>
<td>4239</td>
<td>4805</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18809</td>
<td>20409</td>
<td>20409</td>
<td>20409</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>19037</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>5520</td>
<td>4466</td>
<td>4381</td>
<td>4888</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19305</td>
<td>20905</td>
<td>20905</td>
<td>20905</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>2173</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>20614</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>5650</td>
<td>4609</td>
<td>4524</td>
<td>4968</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19801</td>
<td>21401</td>
<td>21401</td>
<td>21401</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>2669</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>21093</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>5780</td>
<td>4754</td>
<td>4669</td>
<td>5044</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20297</td>
<td>21897</td>
<td>21897</td>
<td>21897</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3165</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>21602</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>5910</td>
<td>4901</td>
<td>4816</td>
<td>5116</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20793</td>
<td>22393</td>
<td>22393</td>
<td>22393</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3661</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>22132</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>6040</td>
<td>5049</td>
<td>4965</td>
<td>5185</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21288</td>
<td>22888</td>
<td>22888</td>
<td>22888</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>4156</td>
<td>3946</td>
<td>22678</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>6170</td>
<td>5199</td>
<td>5115</td>
<td>5250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21783</td>
<td>23383</td>
<td>23383</td>
<td>23383</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>4651</td>
<td>4502</td>
<td>23234</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>5350</td>
<td>5267</td>
<td>5311</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22277</td>
<td>23877</td>
<td>23877</td>
<td>23877</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>5145</td>
<td>5065</td>
<td>23797</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>6430</td>
<td>5504</td>
<td>5420</td>
<td>5367</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22771</td>
<td>24371</td>
<td>24371</td>
<td>24371</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>5639</td>
<td>5631</td>
<td>24363</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>6560</td>
<td>5658</td>
<td>5575</td>
<td>5420</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23264</td>
<td>24864</td>
<td>24864</td>
<td>24864</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>6132</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>24932</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline for enrollment growth is 18,732 in FY06
Fresh category includes first-time freshman and freshman RTFR
Fresh category grows at 130 students per year beginning in FY08
Senior category includes all students above 90 CRH
Retention rates based on percentages for FY05 and 06 adjusted upward to 88% in a linear trend
Senior figures based on percentages for FY05 and 06 adjusted downward to 100% in a linear trend, reflecting improved graduation rates
Actual figures shown in bold italics
Part-time and other category are guesstimates
# Growth Targets for 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>18,492</td>
<td>20,374</td>
<td>24,692</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates, First Professional</td>
<td>7,252</td>
<td>7,642</td>
<td>8,002</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Appointments</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26,039</td>
<td>28,454</td>
<td>33,364</td>
<td>7,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures</td>
<td>$298 M</td>
<td>$476 M</td>
<td>$768 M</td>
<td>$470 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degrees Granted</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>3,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorates Granted</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Instructional and Research Spaces

**Student Trends/General Impacts/ Business Plan Assumptions**

For planning purposes, the committee early on accepted a draft spreadsheet forecasting actual student numbers by class for each year leading up to 2020. This spreadsheet is contained in the Executive Summary section of this report. One of the committee’s recommendations is that such a spreadsheet be refined, updated regularly and shared with all offices impacted by enrollment. OPBPA and IRPE have already began this effort.

For the 2006/2007 academic year the current undergraduate population stands at 19,384. The Top 20 Business model projected undergraduates to be 20,374 in 2012 and to reach 24,692 in 2020.

In addition the business plan also contains a year by year assessment of facility needs (See Top 20 Plan appendix G-7). The model utilized the Kentucky Council on Post Secondary Educations “Space Planning Guidelines for 2002-2006”. The Top 20 model begins with the assumption that UK begins with a deficit of space in classrooms/labs (64,000 ASF) as well as a research space deficit (127,000 ASF). The plan indicates deficits of classroom/lab space to grow to 123,000ASF by 2012 and reach 245,000 ASF by 2020. These calculations are student population driven and are based upon 10 SF per student on classrooms and 8 SF for teaching labs. Finally, the plan shows research space needs hitting 710,000 ASF by 2012 and 1,070,000 by 2020. The research calculation is based upon space required by research dollar volumes. It should be noted these are deficit figures derived from the Business Plan and these would need to be significantly increased if the current Fall 2006 CPE student growth model was pursued.

The space numbers contained in the Business Plan model therefore assumes a need for a significant number of new buildings. For example: the 245,000 ASF classroom/lab space needs above equates to 126% of a Whitehall size classroom building or to 87% of a Chemistry/Physics Building. The research space needs suggests a need for over nine equivalent BBSRB buildings by 2020! Clearly, the “one building funded per each Kentucky General Assembly Session approach” will not meet the demand. In fact, the recently approved Bio-Pharmacy building was funded in phases over two sessions of the General Assembly. The university will require a more aggressive response from the General Assembly as well as a variety of financing approaches along with careful stewardship of existing resources to meet these needs. For the purposes of this report we have attempted to more closely analyze the near term university space needs.

**Instructional Space Impacts in Near Term**

In terms of impact on instructional spaces the proposed increase of student population will be most quickly felt in three specific areas: Chemistry (growth in numbers of required classes and student lab space needs), Biology (growth in number of students declaring biology a
major and/or interest in the sciences), and finally the demand for large lecture spaces for other introductory undergraduate courses.

1. Biology

Biology is the University’s largest undergraduate science major. This is an increasing trend (See the appendix for a detailed chart indicating growth of this major.) Introductory Biology labs are currently at maximum capacity. Average size of these labs have increased as well despite adding two new sections in FY04. The Biology Department faculty to major ratio is increasing as well from 26:1 in the fall of 2002 to the current ratio of 38:1 in fall 2006. The increasing enrollment anticipated by the Business Plan would require additional faculty to maintain or improve these ratios.

Currently Biology is slated to occupy the current Pharmacy Building on Rose Street when the College of Pharmacy moves into their new facility in late fall of 2009. Currently the university has EOP Architects engaged to study the program fit of the Biology program into this building and to detail and estimate the cost of building retrofit. The study is not complete at the time of this writing but a preliminary review indicates the “old” Pharmacy building can generally accommodate the anticipated growth in faculty to meet demand, teaching lab space, preserving classroom space and meeting much of Biology’s expanding research space needs. The cost of renovating this building to serve the needs identified by the Biology Department has been estimated by EOP Architects at $36.9 million dollars (full scope). The building renovation could not begin until 2010 with an expected availability date of 2012.

2. Chemistry

The Chemistry Department will become perhaps the biggest early pressure point associated with the growth in undergraduates. This department must facilitate half of the incoming freshman class in terms of introductory chemistry courses and labs.

The existing Chemistry/Physics Building is in need of significant improvements in terms of classroom renovations, lighting improvements, and creation of additional student lab spaces. Given the nature of the needs associated with this building the committee suggests that the university enter into a contract with an architectural/engineering team as soon as possible to conduct a programming study to identify how the building can be improved to accommodate this growth in students. The cost of this study is estimated at $50,000. Immediately the study should address possible opportunities created by relocating the current Chem/Physics library as well as possible student lab spaces that may be able to be created in 3rd floor underutilized spaces and or by relocating faculty lab spaces. For purposes of preliminary budgeting only the cost of creating
additional student lab spaces in this building is assumed to be $1.5M or $30,000 per student space.

Finally, this building could benefit from updating and refreshing of student spaces. One of the three large lecture halls has recently been renovated at a cost of $384,000. The other two large classroom spaces have not yet been addressed. The cost of renovating these spaces has been estimated at $102 per square foot or about $245,000 each. In addition, lighting in hallways and public spaces are poor and could benefit by re-lamping. Joe Ray-Barreau of the College of Design prepared a brief assessment and offered ideas for improvement. A detailed estimate has not been conducted but a general “rule of thumb” quick cost estimate suggested that if a lighting update throughout the building was pursued the amount could be close to $950,000 depending on fixture selection. Finally, the building has duct problems throughout which have been estimated in our capital plan for replacement at a cost of $2.2 million. Finally, the building has internal water piping problems in some areas that need to be corrected.

For purposes of this report, the near term needs associated with the Chemistry/Physics Building should be assumed to be in the range of $4M to $6M.

3. Large Lecture Rooms

General education requirements create and determine certain “freshman crunch” areas. These include Psychology and Sociology as being most impacted in addition to Biology and Chemistry. The first remediation action in this area involves large lecture rooms seating at least 150. There are only 12 of them on campus and more are needed. For the near term it is recommended that at least one existing auditorium not traditionally used for classes be modified and used for classes 2 hours a day. This would be followed later by the Wethington Building space fit-up.

4. Classrooms and class labs

The following pages address the findings and recommendations regarding classrooms and class labs in general.
Classrooms

A. **Findings:** Our 252 classrooms can seat 12,400 students. The majority of rooms seat between 20 and 49 students. Most classrooms are scheduled first by the department before the Registrar has access for other classes. In very general terms, classrooms are used about 34 hours a week and 65 percent of the seats inside classrooms are used during class. The range of class sizes booked into a room varies greatly. Classes with unusual meeting patterns contribute to poorer room utilization. Registrar-controlled rooms reflect a considerably higher utilization than departmentally controlled rooms. In general, utilization of our larger (over 150 seat) classrooms is greater than our smaller classrooms. There are some large (over 150 seat) assembly rooms on campus that are not used for scheduled classes as a matter of policy or past practice. These are in WTY Library, Taylor Ed, Singletary, Hospital, Student Ctr, and Fine Arts. There are some shelled spaces on campus that could be fit-up as classrooms. These are located in Wethington, Little Library, and Kiononia House. There may be other opportunities for class scheduling into the WTY Library basement, Office Tower 18th floor, and some Student Ctr meeting rooms.

B. **Indications:** Our current classroom assets can accommodate additional classes, both during “business” hours and in the evening. Utilization could likely be increased through centralized scheduling of rooms. A few additional large classrooms of approximately 150 seats each will be needed in the short term. If access to existing assembly rooms and new construction are not able to fulfill the need for additional large tiered lecture halls, it may be feasible to retrofit one of our three old gymnasium style spaces: Taylor Ed, Barker, Alumni Gym.

C. **Recommendations:**
- That the Committee on Effective Instructional Space Utilization be immediately convened, under the direction of a chair, to identify issues and opportunities in effectively utilizing existing classroom space to accommodate increasing enrollment, and to come forward with recommendations to the Provost.
- That the shelled 165 seat classroom in the basement of the Wethington Bldg be fit up as soon as possible and scheduled by the Registrar to meet course needs campus-wide.
- That any modifications in the current Pharmacy Bldg to accommodate Biology preserve the two auditoriums for shared classroom use.
- That large assembly rooms not historically used for scheduled classes, but seating over 150, be made available for one class per semester wherever possible.
- That the Physical Development Master Plan update, to be done by ASG in the fall 2006, include the identification of sites for additional 150 seat lecture halls as building expansions or stand-alone facilities.
Class labs

A. **Findings:** Our 206 class labs have a total of 3,843 student stations. Class labs are specially designed and furnished for a specific course or field of study. In very broad terms, our class labs are used 21 hours per week and 66% of the stations are filled during class. But data indicates two students per station for certain courses. Additional class labs for introductory Chemistry and Interior Design were constructed from existing spaces about 2 years ago to accommodate enrollment increases. Chemistry and Biology are beginning to offer evening classes to accommodate students within current space.

B. **Indications:** Biology will be able to support some growth in enrollment via its evening sessions. However, an additional class lab will be needed in a few years, and before Biology’s occupancy of the old Pharmacy building. Introductory Chemistry will get through the 06-07 year but will need additional class lab space in the fall of 2007. The space for this new class lab might be available through some space use changes and renovations. An additional Biology lab will be needed by fall 2009.

C. **Recommendations:**
   - That space planning begin immediately to carve out space for an additional chemistry class lab, while accommodating the needs of displaced functions. Space planning should then be followed by renovation to make the new space available for classes in fall 2007.
   - That a programming study be commissioned for the Chemistry-Physics Bldg to identify facility solutions to the classroom and class lab needs of current and anticipated enrollment, to the office and research space for added faculty, and in response to a facility condition assessment currently underway.
   - That evening class offerings in introductory Biology continue in order to relieve the pressure there. But begin space planning to create an additional Biology class lab in the Hunt Morgan Building for fall 2009. In addition, Biology’s future occupancy of the vacated Pharmacy Building must be planned so as to relieve pressures on instructional space as enrollment expands.
Classrooms and Class Labs
Some Additional Findings from Appendix Material
October 16, 2006

• Most classrooms are first scheduled by a department, with the Registrar having access to the remaining hours.
• Approximately 43% of classes have a start time other than the prime time period of 9 to 3.
• Approximately 11% of class hours are on Friday.
• Total use is a combination of room use and seat use. In very general terms, total use is 35% when the room is scheduled by a department. Total use is 60% when the room is scheduled by the Registrar.
• Classrooms that seat 51 to 75 are the highest utilized.
• Classrooms are located in buildings 1 to 104 years old. Most of the classroom seats are in buildings constructed between 1960 and 1979.
• The largest number of classrooms seat 20 to 49 students. Larger classrooms seating over 150 are better utilized than rooms seating 20 to 49.
• There are only 12 general-use classrooms that seat 150 or more.
• Medical Center room scheduling is done differently and with different software than used for the rest of campus. Merging of the data has not yet been achieved.
• Considering a class week to be 38 hours, the average classroom remains unused about 7 hours per week, during this 38 hour period.
• The current space utilization reporting identifies a number of “unused” classrooms each semester. (i.e. No match is found between the room and the class schedule). Per past reports, the percent of unused classrooms for Fall 2005 was 6.58%, and for Spring 2006 was 7.56%. But there are discrepancies in how the report identifies rooms as unused.
• Two very similar classrooms in the same general area of campus had total usage of 88% (Registrar controlled) and 42% (department controlled).
Instructional Norms

The committee found that, over the years, certain instructional practices have become the norm and have proven satisfactory in times of steady enrollment and space expansion. These practices have shaped the instructional day and the instructional week. But with the student enrollment expansion accompanying top 20 growth, these established norms need to be examined in light of existing instructional space limitations. It will be years before additional teaching space can be constructed. And even with construction, the university will still be experiencing a space deficit as research growth competes for the limited construction dollar. The Commonwealth will not be financially supportive of construction of additional teaching space until the utilization reports depict good utilization of current spaces. Behoove it to say, all types of space will have to be very well utilized.

The committee suggests the appointment of a task force to study and recommend changes in established norms regarding instruction in order to maximize the efficient use of current, as well as future, instructional facilities. Among other topics, this committee should critically review:

a. the current M W F and T Th scheduling
b. an evening program in which core courses are offered and provide opportunities to students working during the day
c. the 75 minute TTh classes in favor of other models
d. first semester “rescue courses” in the winter intersession to put students back on track
e. prohibition of MWF classes that do not meet on Fridays
f. extending peak class hours beyond the 9-3 timeframe
g. scheduling and conducting additional Friday classes
h. less convenient classroom assignments, when warranted, to avoid underutilization campus-wide
i. fewer faculty-imposed limitations placed on schedules for particular classes
j. establishing a maximum class size for large lectures
k. making additional college teaching spaces available for campus-wide use, where possible
l. placing limitations on classes with very irregular or infrequent sessions, such as Discovery and 4-credit hour courses
m. the use of distance learning technology for course offerings outside the classroom
Office & Research Space for Additional Faculty

A. **Findings:** Fifty-four (54) additional faculty will be hired by the fall of 2008. Most of these will be within the college of Arts & Sciences which is housed in several buildings. Departmental assignment of these 54 lines within the colleges however could call for considerable office space within a single building. Faculty members typically have their own private offices. The office needs of other instructional staff add to the competition for office space. Externally funded grants and contracts will require office space. Research space needs of new faculty members will vary. The functional needs of dry research can usually be met through the assignment and/or renovation of office or meeting types of spaces. Wet bench research typically requires complex ventilation and piping. Space design must meet safety codes.

B. **Indications:** Existing space can accommodate some of the office and dry-research needs of these faculty additions, but priority will have to be given to office space. The scarcity of space will force evaluation of the relative priorities of space use and the highest and best use of each space. Funding will be needed to fit up shelled space, to convert space use, and to renovate spaces that cannot be occupied. Certain offices and support functions may likely need to be relocated to UK owned houses surrounding campus or to leased space in Lexington by fall 2008. Each capital construction project will need to increase the institution’s office space inventory as needed for decompression and for planned faculty/staff growth prior to the next capital expansion. Modular office buildings on or adjacent to campus may have to become part of the surge space solution. There is very little opportunity to provide additional wet research space on campus. And that limited amount of space will come only after renovations of older, substandard wet space or support spaces. The option to upgrade dry office-type spaces through extensive renovation is indeed available. However academic space supporting enrollment and faculty growth will not be candidates for such conversions, nor will space housing dry research needing to remain on campus. Relocations involving certain functions being moved off campus, followed by extensive space renovations, may provide some short term relief. But construction of wet bench research space is required if recruitment of additional science faculty is to move forward.

C. **Recommendations:**

- That the deans quickly formulate estimates of faculty growth by department for Provost approval as realistic planning figures.
- That the Provost Office of Resource Mgmt begin space reviews of these departments, followed by exploration of space solutions on and off campus.
- That budgetary planning allocate funds for relocations, renovations, and furnishings as needed to improve space utilization and accommodate additional staff.
- That university capital planning and funding yield additional office and research space in proportion to planned faculty expansion.
- That the institution investigate the purchase of medium-sized office buildings adjacent to campus to provide quick access to additional space and to benefit from the synergies of having a critical mass of UK functions in a single remote location.
Space for Additional TA’s, FTI’s, and PTI’s

A. **Findings:** Teaching assistants typically have an office cubicle in a room with other TA cubicles or other functions such as copying, supplies, or reference materials. Departments try to provide PTI’s and FTI’s with a semi-private office housing 2 or 3 instructors. Most PTI’s in the evening do not have space on campus during the day for office hours. Some TA’s and PTI’s use the department’s conference room or common space if space cannot be assigned to them. Teaching assistants and instructors need to be located such that they are reasonably accessible to undergraduates for office hours. As a reference point, A&S has been provided with 12.5 TA’s, 5 FTI’s, and 30 PTI’s in response to enrollment growth between now and fall 2009. Faculty and faculty support staff numbers will also increase in response to enrollment expansion and so add to the competition for office space. Externally funded grants and contracts will require office space for staff and related functions.

B. **Indications:** Existing space can accommodate some of these staff additions. But priority will have to be given to new faculty and their office space needs. The scarcity of space will force evaluation of the relative priorities of space use and the highest and best space use of each space. Funding will be needed to fit up shelled space, to convert space use, and to renovate unoccupied spaces. Densities of current TA, PTI, and FTI space will need to be increased until additional space can be fit up or constructed. The ability to accommodate these added staff in or near their own department will vary and will not be possible in some cases.

Certain offices and support functions may likely need to be relocated to UK owned houses surrounding campus or to leased space in Lexington by fall 2008. Each capital construction project will need to directly and indirectly increase the institution’s office space inventory as needed for decompression and for planned faculty/staff growth prior to the next capital expansion. Though avoided by the institution in the past, modular office buildings on or adjacent to campus may have to become part of the surge space solution.

C. **Recommendations:**

- That the deans quickly formulate estimates of growth in TA, PTI, and FTI lines by department for Provost approval as realistic planning figures.
- That the Provost Office of Resource Mgmt begin space reviews of these departments, followed by exploration of space solutions elsewhere on campus.
- That budgetary planning allocate funds for relocations, renovations, and furnishings as needed to improve space utilization and accommodate additional staff.
Space for Additional Faculty Support Staff

A. **Findings:** Space for the additional technical and clerical staff necessary to further support the needs of the new and existing faculty must be taken into consideration. The need for additional faculty support staff was accentuated in the recently unveiled Work-Life Survey. Staff members occupy a variety of spaces such as: private offices, entrances to office suites, cubicles and shared offices. These additional staff will also add to the competition for office space. Externally funded grants and contracts will also require office space for staff and related functions. Some grants and contracts are entirely office-based.

B. **Indications:** Existing space can accommodate some of these staff additions, but priority will have to be given to new faculty and their office space needs. The scarcity of space will force evaluation of the relative priorities of space use and the highest and best space use of each space. Funding will be needed to fit up shelled space, to convert space use, and to renovate unoccupied spaces. The ability to accommodate these added staff in or near their own department will vary and will not be possible in some cases.

Certain offices and support functions may likely need to be relocated to UK owned houses surrounding campus or to leased space in Lexington by fall 2008. Each capital construction project will need to directly and indirectly increase the institution’s office space inventory as needed for decompression and for planned staff growth prior to the next capital expansion. Though avoided by the institution in the past, modular office buildings on or adjacent to campus may have to become part of the surge space solution.

C. **Recommendations:**

- That the deans quickly formulate estimates of staff growth by department for Provost approval as realistic planning figures.
- That the Provost Office of Resource Mgmt begin space reviews of these departments, followed by exploration of space solutions elsewhere on campus.
- That budgetary planning allocate funds for relocations, renovations, and furnishings as needed to improve space utilization and accommodate additional staff.
Housing
Full Text in Appendix

A. **Findings:** The current capacity in undergraduate housing is 5,616 beds. These beds are mostly in traditional configuration (double loaded corridors/gang bath and showers). The occupancy rate in the 2006-07 academic year is 98%. There are 855 beds in the system that is not air-conditioned, which creates some dissatisfaction among the residents assigned to these beds. In general, a facility assessment of current housing facilities classifies facility condition as “Good”. There are 299 beds in Greg Page apartments where upper class (or any non-freshmen) is assigned. This facility presents some difficulty in management and programming. Due to low occupancy in 2005-06, an agreement is in place between Housing and BCTCS to supply up to 418 beds in the Greg Page complex exclusively for use by their students. This agreement expires in May 2008. There are approximately 725 apartments in Graduate and Family housing. Occupancy is high throughout the system. Leases are generally 12-month leases.

B. **Indicators:** Housing can support some growth in freshmen. In the 2009-2010 academic year, it is projected that demand will exceed the supply of beds in undergraduate housing. Housing supply will fall short of demand by 240 beds in 2011; 517 beds in 2013; 829 beds in 2015, 1,160 beds in 2017; and 1,670 beds by 2020. In order to fill the expected demand from freshmen and continue to supply beds to returning students, a total of $210 million (numbers include 5% annual cost increase) will be required for new housing construction. The additional graduate students will also generate additional demand for apartments, creating the need for additional housing.

C. **Recommendations from Housing:**

- Continue work on the current Housing and Dining Trust Indenture to allow for more progressive financing plans.
- Develop plan to privatize the on-campus construction of approximately 240 beds needed by 2011.
- Authorize additional housing in future Capital Plans.
- Consider limits on non-freshmen in on-campus housing until additional capacity is available.
- Maintain a mix of on-campus housing such that some students at various class levels can live on campus.
- Limit BCTCS students to 113 beds beginning 2008-09, which is the amount in the master agreement between KCTCS and UK.
- Always have a mix of housing (all class levels); not all for freshmen.
Dining

A. **Findings:** One critical factor to consider when determining future seating requirements for Dining Services is the activity or the number of transactions that occur on a daily basis in the dining units, particularly during the peak hours of lunch and dinner. A recent transaction analysis revealed that the lunch participation rate for our residential students is 41.1%, while the dinner participation rate is 31%. This is lower than what is typically found on other campuses, where lunch participation for residential students tends to be at least 85% and dinner is 80%. The transaction analysis also indicated that our capture rate for non-meal plan customers is 11.4%. This tends to be a lower capture rate than what is experienced on other campuses, which can vary from 15% to 25%.

As it now stands, the total number of seats required to accommodate lunch customers during peak hours is 1,095. The total number of seats available is 1,442. Likewise, the total number of seats required to accommodate dinner customers during peak hours is 392, while the total number of seats available is 768. Our national consultants indicate that customers typically do not change eating patterns. Therefore, if the current participation rates remain consistent through 2020, there would be no shortage of seats in the dining units.

B. **Indications:** One factor that will most certainly impact seating requirements in the future is the continued renovation of all dining facilities and the improvement of menu offerings. Increasing the number of food platforms that offer exhibition or display cooking, will also be a factor. This trend has already started. Our consultants indicate that the more improvements made (particularly to the facilities) the greater the participation rates, since we will be offering the types of food and services our customers are seeking. Assuming that this will be the case and using figures adjusted for current industry averages, there would be a need for 262 additional seats during lunch and 359 additional seats during dinner in 2020. This also assumes that the number of non-meal plan customers during lunch remains at 11.4%. If this capture rate increases, then the number of seats required at lunch will increase proportionately to the increased number of customers served.

C. **Recommendations:**
- Develop new partnerships with academic colleges and/or other units to build smaller grab-n-go venues, particularly in areas where new construction is being planned. A good example of this would be the new Student Health Center, the new Business School, etc.
- Continue renovation plans for Blazer Café and other outdated dining facilities with the goal of making all dining facilities a destination, not just a place for students to purchase food and leave.
- Consider the new Student Center proposal and how it will impact future dining needs.
- Consider the development of a new free-standing facility to be constructed in a central location on campus.
Campus Parking

A. **Findings:** The University currently manages an inventory of 19,001 parking spaces which accommodates a total population of 46,835 University and BCTC employees and students as well as VA Hospital employees. This translates to 2.46 people for every parking space. This ratio places us 8th when compared to our 19 established benchmark institutions. Additionally, among regional schools we have more spaces per person than Northern and Western Kentucky Universities, as well as the University of Cincinnati and West Virginia University. Debt service capacity currently comprises 47% of the total Parking and Transportation Services’ operating budget (approximately $4,169,000) with no substantial debt relief until FY 2015-2016. Visitor parking on north campus continues to be a critical issue. Insufficient parking exists to support events at the Singletary Center for the Arts, and Memorial Coliseum, as well as daily visitors to the Art Museum. Planned parking losses in this area will only add to this problem. Parking and Transportation Services is responsible for indirect and utility costs as a result of their 2004 shift from general fund to auxiliary service status. While these assessments combine to account for $450,000 in expense this fiscal year, these numbers are expected to grow to over $1,000,000 in the coming years.

B. **Indications:** Parking will experience a double impact from implementation of the Top-20 business plan. The parking demand will grow as a result of the increase in population, while the supply will be reduced through the construction of new facilities on existing surface parking to accommodate this growth. Focusing on the known population growth defined by the business plan and the anticipated parking losses over the next five years, we expect the people per space will grow to 2.78 by 2012 and to 3.07 by 2020. Keeping pace with today’s ratios over the coming years would require the University to construct an additional 2,352 spaces by 2012 and a total of 4,516 spaces by 2020.

C. **Recommendations from UK Parking:** The University must address our parking challenges broadly. We will not be able to build our way out of these challenges and must look to implement a wide range of solutions to meet our future campus access needs.

- The University must strive to gain better utilization of existing resources. Parking reaches its peak between 10am and 3pm Monday through Thursday. Significant parking availability exists in the early morning hours and in the late afternoon and evening, with consistent parking inefficiencies experienced on Fridays.
- We recommend the University continue to grow the parking supply through the construction of additional parking facilities. However, we will be unable to keep pace with the population growth or construction losses and therefore must search for alternative campus access mechanisms.
- The 2005 bicycle master plan indicates that the University has the realistic capability to increase our bicycling commuting population to 7% by 2012. To achieve this level of participation, the University will need to work closely with LFUCG as well as invest in campus bicycle infrastructure.
- Only five of our 19 benchmark schools do not have a student transportation fee. Currently we fund our campus transportation out of existing parking revenue. Implementation of a transportation fee would free up parking revenue to address parking issues while allowing dedicated funding to address improving mass transit as a viable campus access option.
Near Term Space Opportunities

In addition to the opportunities to improve the utilization of existing classroom hours, the committee also identified some near term opportunities to make additional space available for growth initiatives. These are briefly listed here and being further analyzed and developed in concert with the 08-14 capital planning process.

a. Space rearrangements in Chemistry-Physics Building for an additional chemistry class lab.
b. Modifications of some auditoriums for some class lecture use
c. Moving some business functions off-campus, such as the Data Center.
d. Wethington basement shelled classroom fit-up
e. Consolidation of a Science & Engineering library
f. Little Library 3rd floor shelled space fit-up
g. Pence Hall Addition to free up valuable space in three other buildings (longer term project).
h. Adding staircases to Funkhouser tower to convert from storage use to office/teaching use
i. Koinonia House shelled space fit-up
j. Carnahan House upgrades to allow office use.
k. Cooper House shelled space fit-up
l. Conversion of old TV studio in Taylor Education
2006 - 2012 Space Construction Needs

The aggressive expansions of faculty, student enrollment, and research activities as depicted in the top 20 Business Plan will require the construction of additional buildings at a rate far in excess of space growth in recent decades. The Business Plan acknowledges this as it maps out the space and construction funding needed in the years ahead. It will be difficult, and costly, to accommodate the first few years of growth without the opportunity to move into newly constructed buildings on campus. But all options will be exercised, including relocating campus functions into off-campus leased space.

Excluding housing, a total of 1,075,000 assignable square feet is needed to accommodate growth to 2012. The needed space is equivalent to over 8 buildings the size of the Patterson Office Tower. Some of this new space is needed to offset current space deficits. But capital projects needed in that same time frame will require state authority and funding early in the 08-10 biennium to allow for the typical 3 to 4 years design and construction period. July 2008 will be the next opportunity to acquire state authority for construction. Authority in 2008 results in a completed building in 2011 at the earliest.

Consideration needs to be given to construction types that yield more square footage for the dollars and reduce construction time. Michigan and Berkley are two examples of campuses that tailored some of their space expansion methods to their need for fast program growth. The growth detailed in the Top 20 Business Plan will require non-traditional thinking to yield the required square footage within financial realities.

The biennial capital planning process is currently underway with identified projects responding to the need for aggressive expansion of space. In addition and on a parallel course, a facility strategies map is being developed to better illustrate the types of space projects, the timing, and funding level considerations.

All future building projects on campus must go beyond the needs of the initial occupants and respond to the institution’s needs for certain types of space, even in cases where the construction funds involve private or corporate gifts. In some cases, this may require a relaxation of the donor’s restrictions. It may also require design modifications such that more spaces can be shared. Prioritization of buildable space may result in space being dedicated to institutional needs that go beyond the building under review.
Community Facilities Required for UK Growth

A. **Findings:** The largest issue facing the University of Kentucky in the area of facility growth is the need to assure that adequate sanitary sewer capacity is available through the Lexington Fayette Urban County Government sewer system. Currently the available capacity in the city’s Wolf Run sewer shed system is quickly becoming a highly limiting factor to growth. This situation will be identical to constraints faced by the university six years ago. At that time the university and city entered into an agreement to cooperatively finance and construct a pumping station and force main as a relief sewer system. Under terms of that agreement UK, in exchange for payment of about $1.8 million (paid by UK through a five year financing plan arranged by city), was allocated a set capacity at the station. This capacity will be very close to being consumed by the new hospital; Bio Pharmacy Building and Student Health. The university is about two years away from a serious sewer constraint controlling growth on campus most particularly in the area to the west of Limestone and to a large extent in the overall Medical Center.

B. **Indications:** As the city continues to struggle with infrastructure problems, EPA enforcement actions, and ongoing community friction regarding the appropriateness of and proper locations for community growth, the university can easily become drawn into the fray on the sanitary sewer front.

All sewer sheds are impacted: Town Branch which serves the north campus; as well as West Hickman which serves the southeast quadrant of campus; and more importantly for Top 20 advancement, Wolf Run which serves the health care areas and the future growth area to the west of Limestone Street.

C. **Recommendations:**

- The university should immediately co-fund an engineering analysis (UK share approximately $250,000) with LFUCG on options to address sewer capacity in Wolf Run and Town Branch. This will require LFUCG being agreeable to proceed quickly.

- The university must also begin working with the community (Mayor, Council, Commerce Lexington etc.) to educate them about the pending critical nature of this sanitary sewer capacity problem.

- The university should be prepared to fund a sewer construction assessment from LFUCG to create additional capacity once the study is completed. For simple estimating/placeholder purposes only, a $2,000,000 amount should be kept in any short term UK financial plan. Until the study is completed we can not arrive at anything beyond a guess at this point using our history of six years ago as a very rough guide.
College Student Service Offices

Introduction

Input was obtained from the student service offices within the dean's office of each of the 16 colleges. All 16 written narratives were summarized into a one-page overview. However all 16 submittals are in the appendix as they were submitted.
A. **Findings:** The staff needs and space needs of the current student support offices of the 16 colleges vary. In some situations the current need for space exceeds the need for added staff and faculty advisors. But the reverse is true in some cases. Those currently feeling like they are “getting by” and will continue to “get by” for a year or two are BE & E, Dentistry, Design, Engineering, Fine Arts, Health Sciences, Medicine and Public Health. Those with current space and/or staff concerns are Ag (esp. HES), A & S, CIS, Law, Pharmacy, Social Work, Nursing and Education.

Concerns expressed by the colleges include lack of faculty advisors, special needs of students on probation, space limitations and privacy, additional efforts to expand student diversity and improve retention, special service needs of a more diverse student body, burdens of technology implementation, shortage of staff, and the added attention transfer students need.

As the colleges think forward to the expanding enrollment, their number 1 concern is meeting student needs, especially the enlarging and expanding needs of a more diverse student body. Another concern is that of the availability of faculty advisors.

B. **Indications:** Space and staffing resources needed by each college student support office will vary as their enrollment expands. The point at which the concern over a decline in services becomes urgent will differ with time, enrollment, diversity of enrollment, and the ability to reallocate college resources. But, it is clear that additional staff and space will be needed in these college services. Projected staff expansions range from A&S’s 7 FTEs to Engineering’s status quo. The general feel is 1 FTE per college by 2012. Space needs range from 7 offices, to records space, to a different type of space, to the status quo. Of course, all this is subject to change with actual experiences and pressure at the time.

C. **Recommendations:**

- That appropriate university offices keep the colleges informed of enrollment goals, trends, enrollment initiatives, degree interests, diversity goals, and changes in degree requirements affecting multiple colleges.
- That annual budgeting and institutional resource allocation be responsive to the need for college student support offices (particularly advising & retention) to grow to meet the needs of a larger and more diverse student body.
- That college and institutional space planning be responsive to the incremental space needs of these student offices and assist them with space options, improvements through space reconfiguration, and the acquisition of space whenever possible.
Input was obtained from various campus-wide services listed below:

- Academic Enhancement
- Campus Transportation
- Campus Recreation
- Central Advising
- Counseling & Testing
- Dean of Students
- Disability Resource Center
- Enrollment Management
- Experiential Education
- Graduation Agreement
- Libraries
- Multicultural Affairs
- Police services (UK)
- Student Center activities and services
- Student Employment Service
- Student Health Service
- Technology infrastructure
- Writing Center

Each office provided a written submittal and some made a presentation to the committee. The written submittals vary greatly in format and length. The committee summarized the lengthy ones and arranged for all to have a similar 3-part format.
Academic Enhancement Summary
Full Text in Appendix

A. **Findings:** Academic Enhancement is a student support service that provides tutoring for nearly all entry level courses and has come to be known by the students as The Study. In addition to tutoring for most freshman and sophomore entry level courses, the Center offers individual academic consulting, and learning and study skill seminars. The Center is a result of the Provost’s Task Force on the First Year Experience.

Academic Enhancement moved to the lower level of W.T. Young Library during the summer of 2006. This move puts Academic Enhancement in the middle of the newly created Information Commons. Actual opening of the Information Commons is scheduled for late fall of 2006. This partnership with the Information Commons strategically places Academic Enhancement within a key destination hot-spot for students. The Information Commons will provide increased traffic to the library and provide an increased awareness of the services available from Academic Enhancement. This partnership also gives Academic Enhancement access to additional surge space for periodic student overloads during peak times of the semester calendar.

In 2005-2006, Academic Enhancement served over 2000 students. During this time, math tutoring was the responsibility of the Math Skellar. In the summer of 2006, at the request of the students and the Dean of Arts & Science, Academic Enhancement took over the responsibility of tutoring entry level math.

B. **Indications:** With the relocation of Academic Enhancement, the Information Commons will be able to provide temporary surge space during peak student visits. For the 06-07 year, 10,000 student contacts for services are projected. Additional services such as the tutoring for entry level math will significantly increase student visits. It is also projected that student request for help and services will grow proportionally due to increased enrollment and will grow as much as 20% per year due to increased student awareness. Additional student visits will require additional staff, including full-time positions, Teaching Assistants, and peer tutoring/student employees.

C. **Recommendations:**
- Provide funding for additional staff.
- Develop a plan with the Information Commons administration for both temporary surge space for semester peak loads and for permanent space for sustained growth.
The Impact of Student Growth on the Campus Transportation
Full Text in Appendix

A. Findings: The Campus Area Transit System (CATS) supports four routes making up a dual system consisting of both buses managed and operated by the University as well as LexTran city buses. Currently, the campus transit system has available capacity to accommodate additional riders. However, as the campus population expands and PTS increases its efforts to market the CATS buses, we anticipate most if not all of the capacity will be absorbed by latent demand. Parking and Transportation Services operates 14 buses in the Campus Area Transit System. This fleet provides enough capacity to meet current demand along with enough capacity to support the anticipated growth. LexTran operates between four and six city coaches on the Stadium route depending on the time of day. During the peak periods of the fall semester, this service level is supplemented by two additional buses. Following the initial semester peak, this service returns to normal levels. However, with the anticipated parking losses and campus population projections, we anticipate that we may need to formalize the additional bus service further into the academic year which will result in higher contractual costs.

B. Indications: The University does not have adequate storage or maintenance facilities the CATS bus fleet. Long-term campus planning calls for the narrowing of campus streets which may impact the efficiency of the bus system. As campus parking demand continues to increase, we may decide to operate an off-campus park and ride system which could result in additional expense. Restricting freshman parking on campus would require additional campus transit service and a reliance on our regional transit authority, both of which result in higher costs. Hiring and retaining drivers remains an ongoing concern. LexTran and area charter companies offer better hourly wages. While UK provides better benefits, many of the drivers are retired from other employment so benefits are not a major incentive. Due to the flexible nature of the bus service, we often do not have enough drivers available to handle the peak periods. Some bus shelters (Washington and Stadium) are often over capacity during peaks. Currently, the campus transit system is supported exclusively through parking permit and visitor revenue. Under this financial model, we will continue to place additional burden on the transit system while at the same time limiting or reducing the revenue stream through anticipated parking losses.

C. Recommendations:
- Pursue initiatives to make alternative transportation modes (biking, walking, car/van pooling, flexible work schedules, telecommuting arrangements, etc.) truly viable and encourage their use.
- Invest in transit infrastructure, such as additional bus shelters, signage, real-time transit displays.
- Continue efforts to improve bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure on campus, including implementation of the UK Bicycle Master Plan.
- Continue to coordinate with LexTran, LFUCG and the Lexington Area MPO to encourage and promote infrastructure that will accommodate alternative transportation modes.
- Work with LexTran to develop a reduced rate or free transit pass program for students and employees.
- Increasing permit fees can help offset revenue shortfalls as needed, but a dedicated student transportation fee would allow for a more responsive and sustainable financial model and would be preferable.
A. **Findings:** Indoor facilities include Johnson Ctr., Seaton Ctr., Alumni Gym, and Lancaster Aquatics. Outdoor facilities include tennis courts, basketball courts on north and south campus, Alumni Dr. club sports fields (3 each) and student recreation fields (6 acres).

The Johnson Ctr. has been extremely popular since it opened in 2003. Current average use is 2,600 users per day. Peak times reach 4,000 users per day. For several weeks at the beginning of each semester, long waiting lines form between 4 and 10pm for certain forms of recreation or exercise activity. Students then make adjustments and waiting lines subside. The Johnson Ctr. is used as a marketing tool for the University.

The Seaton Ctr. is used for intramural sports and special events. This allows Johnson Ctr. to remain available for open recreation.

Alumni Gym is shared with Athletics, with Athletics having the day time hours, Monday through Friday. This evening and weekend access to the gym again helps keep Johnson Ctr. free for recreation. Recreational Facilities on north campus are limited.

The outdoor facilities appear to be meeting the current demand. However, the biggest challenge is keeping the fields in playable condition.

B. **Indications:** Increasing awareness of the benefits of physical exercise, continued use of recreational facilities in UK marketing, and the planned enrollment expansion will all contribute to overcrowding and frustration, especially at the beginning of each semester. Access during the after-class-day hours of 4 to 10 pm will become more limited. Overcrowding and waiting lines will send and undesirable message to visiting parents and prospective students.

Outdoor courts and fields will see more use. Maintenance of these facilities will become more problematic and costly.

C. **Recommendations:**
- That a cost-benefit feasibility assessment be done for applying artificial turf to certain outdoor fields.
- That Alumni Gym areas vacated by Athletics in spring 2007 be assigned to Campus Recreation to expand services on north campus.
- That other Alumni Gym spaces be made available to Campus Recreation or those functions can be relocated to other campus space in the future.
- That the University's Capital Planning continue to appropriately prioritize the expansion of student recreation facilities to allow for reasonable access for a larger student body.
A. **Findings:** Increased enrollment will directly affect Central Advising’s workload, though it is difficult to accurately predict how much. Policy set by other units affects the student to advisor ratio, and Central Advising is not always made aware of these policy changes until they happen. Currently, satisfaction rates among Central Advising students is on par with that of advisors in colleges, and the target ratio of students to advisors in Central Advising is being met with some success.

B. **Indications:** The expected increase in Central Advising's workload from the 03-04 year to the 11-12 year is about a 2,500 student increase as charted in the appendix of this report. This amount of increase will see the need for an additional office assistant to deal with the increase in traffic, as well as an additional advisor to maintain the 250:1 ratio that provides Central Advising its success. Central Advising’s office is running at capacity, so the increase in staff would mean the need for more space. Salary competitiveness is also a growing concern as Central Advising has lost members to Fayette county schools over salary issues. Competitive salaries provide security, stability, and flexibility in recruiting and maintaining a diverse staff.

C. **Recommendations:**
- Hire 1 office assistant to regulate increased office and phone traffic
- Hire 1 additional Advisor to keep 250:1 ratio a reality
- Move, renovate, or annex more space to accommodate the additional
  - hires.
- Increase funding for salaries to stay competitive with Fayette and surrounding counties, and to maintain diversity among the staff.
Counseling & Testing Summary  
Full Text in Appendix

A. **Findings:** C&T is working with fewer psychologists than is recommended by the IACS. While the past few years have seen an increase in C&T staffing, the ideal ratio has not been met. The ratio set by the International Association of Counseling Services, Inc. (IACS) is supposed to be 1500:1, and is currently somewhere around 2300:1. This ratio is currently not posing serious issues; however, if UK’s student population grows considerably, the need for increased staff will become more pressing. Needs are changing as the success of outreach programs changes the kinds of students seeking help. C&T is seeing an increase in long-term clients requiring more specialized staff skills for counseling, and less short-term needs clients. The services C&T provides affect university life in many areas reaching from students, to faculty and staff, and are aimed at helping the university increase retention and produce productive members of the community.

B. **Indications:** C&T’s ability to maintain the breadth and quality of its services is inversely proportional to appropriate reaction to the growth of enrollment. With a present need for more psychologists in order to meet the ideal ratio, a growth in student population presents an even greater need. If more staff is not hired, counseling sessions will be both fewer and shorter, and referrals will increase sending UK students to the outside community to face higher rates for similar services. Waiting lists will grow and become an even greater deterrent for students to seek the help they need affecting their potential to stay in school. An increase of staff leads to an increase in space needs as well. A specific issue arises with space needs because of confidentiality. Offices must be able to provide a person a reasonable amount of anonymity to the outside, as well as be soundproof. With the rise of students having more serious and long-term needs, psychologists must have appropriate amounts of time to research, confer with colleagues, and study cases outside of appointments. Space needs can be met for the next 5 years, even with added staff, if additional space (mentioned in recommendations) is acquired.

C. **Recommendations:**

- Increase the number of clinical staff incrementally to maintain the 1500:1 ratio of students to counselors.
- Provide additional spaces for the expanding clinical staff and client load.
- Create an American Psychological Association approved internship program (4 nationally recruited inters and one additional supervising psychologist) providing for some of the increasing staff needs at a cost effective rate.
A. **Findings:** The Dean of Students Office is comprised of the Central Office (including student discipline), New Student and Parent Programs, Campus Recreation, Disability Resource Center, Alcohol Education, Fraternity and Sorority Affairs, and University Health Service. The increase in the student population will have a significant impact on the staffing, budget, facilities, and services of these departments.

Several of our programs are already feeling the effects of this year’s enrollment increase. The Johnson Center, Campus Recreation’s primary facility, was designed for 2,000 daily users, and the current average is 2,600. The Disability Resource Center is significantly understaffed compared to our benchmarks. Currently, the number of UK 101 sections cannot be expanded significantly due to a lack of instructors, shortage of suitable classroom space, and strains placed on offices affiliated with the UK 101 course.

B. **Indications:** Regarding further enrollment increases, the Dean of Students staff will require seven additional professional staff members. Additional work/office space will be essential, and all departments in the Dean of Students will require increased budgets to continue offering the same level of programs and services. The consequences of not addressing and meeting the needs of students will result in lower retention rates and lower student and parent satisfaction with the University of Kentucky.

C. **Recommendations:**

- That the Dean of Students’ office hire seven additional professional staff members—1 Campus Recreation, 2 Disability Resource Center, 2 Fraternity/Sorority Affairs, 1 Central Office, 1 New Student and Parent Programs—and 1 staff assistant for the Disability Resource Center by 2011.
- Either totally renovate Alumni Gym and hire 1 professional staff member and 4 graduate students or expand the Johnson Center.
- That Disability Resources hire an additional two professional staff and one staff assistant with corresponding office space and budgets.
A. **Findings:** The DRC currently serves ca. 700 students with permanent and temporary disabilities. This includes students with physical and cognitive disabilities as well as those with chronic health conditions. The staff consists of: Director, Cognitive Disabilities Consultant, Accommodations Consultant, and Staff Assistant. Additionally, the DRC employees five sign language interpreters who are classified at temporary part time. Students also assist as three work study students are on payroll plus an ongoing pool of community service “volunteer” students. A comparison with University benchmark institutions shows that the Center is currently understaffed. As a result, the Center will be requesting funding for graduate assistants and other student employment for the next school year. The office space includes: reception area, four staff offices which includes one office for a non University Office for the Blind employee, large workroom (supplies, archival files, kitchen, photocopier), student computer lab, conference room, storage room, Textbook Recording Studio and Accessible Textbook Library. The reception area and four offices have been recently upgraded and have an excellent appearance. The Center needs are being met with the existing space with the exception of office functions limited by noise from daytime use of the upstairs gym.

B. **Indications:** Current staffing levels and office space cannot support any significant increase in students. In contrast, there will be adequate storage space with what is currently available. Likewise, there will not be a need for additional space for the Accessible Textbook Library and the Textbook Recording Studio.

C. **Recommendations:**

- Evaluate the staffing level required for the student increase. It is anticipated that it would include two professional staff and an additional staff assistant.
- Renovate/expand space at Alumni Gym for new staff or move the office to a new location. If Center remains in Alumni Gym, eliminate use of the gymnasium during the day.
- Increase the office operating budget and the interpreter services budget.
- Contact other University offices to insure they have included students with disabilities in their future plans especially Housing & Parking.
A. **Findings:** Each of the areas of Enrollment Management will see an increase in workload related to increased enrollment. Classroom scheduling is most immediately affected by the increase while some other areas like Advising Conferences are affected, but not as urgently, and still others like Summer School will face little to no impact in need of university attention. There are very few high capacity instructional spaces on campus, so more class sections must be offered. In general, Enrollment Management areas are functioning well at present, but needs are arising for staff, space, and funding, as well as for re-structuring in some cases like Academic Scholarships. The areas of Academic Scholarships, Admission, Advising Conferences, Classroom Scheduling, Recruitment, Summer School, Student Records, Independent Study, Financial Aid, Evening and Weekend Programs/Adult Student Services, and Student Billing have specific goals for incremental growth available in the appendix. In many cases, these plans include more staff, space, and budget increases, as well as reorganization at pre-determined staff levels.

B. **Indications:** The areas of Academic Scholarships, Admission, Advising Conferences, Classroom Scheduling, Recruitment, Summer School, Student Records, Independent Study, Financial Aid, Evening and Weekend Programs/Adult Student Services, and Student Billing will all need to grow incrementally with the growth of admissions. Detailed estimates are available in the full text appendix. The areas of expressed concern are most commonly operational funding, additional staff, and accommodating the space needs of new staff so that as work load increases, so does Enrollment Management’s ability to handle it. These needs will require action, except for Summer School whose solution is tied to summer enrollment being a fraction of fall and spring. Without following the plans of each department, meeting the goals of the top 20 business plan will be more difficult. To use an analogy, Enrollment Management stands at the front door of the university as all applicants, freshmen, and transfer students approach that door. Successful enrollment expansion will depend heavily on the staffing, skills, and resources of our Enrollment Management office.

C. **Recommendations:**

- Make more classroom hours available to the Registrar by 07-08
- Allocate additional financial and spatial resources, incrementally throughout the service offices, as needed for recruiting and enrollment growth
- Increase staffing in Student Billing before 07-08
- Increase funding for marketing and recruiting publications.
- Consider establishing a recruiting office in Louisville
Experiential Education and Career Center

Full Text in Appendix

A. Findings: In October of 2000 a 14,000+ square foot building was opened for the Career Center. This “housed” Office of Experiential Education (i.e, internship program, shadowing and service-learning) and Career Services. For more than 10 years the Career Center has operated “satellite” offices in several colleges on campus. The number of employers for 2005-06 On-Campus Recruiting (OCR) was up 19% from last year, with 39 new employers participating. In July 2004, with no additional resources or personnel, career counselors were asked to take on the additional responsibilities of working with students to secure internships, faculty sponsors, learning contracts, etc. for more than 29 majors on campus which require internships. Our Student/Staff ratio remains one of the highest (1:1993) compared to seven of our benchmarks and other public KY universities. In July 2006 Experiential Education and Career Services experienced almost a complete staff turn-over.

B. Indications: Our building was designed and built with growth in mind. I project we will not outgrow this new space in many years to come. three additional undergraduate peer tutors will be required. With the implementation of IRIS, our support staff roles have changed and we need to reclassify many of these now that they have taken on advanced functions such as HRS, FRS and budget. Employer growth due to an upturn in the economy and a demand for college-educated workers has increased substantially. This is a good problem to have, but it is not without its problems. This growth has taxed the Employer Relations staff and the career counselors who prepare students for interviews, internships and full-time employment. Our student usage continues to grow and will continue to grow as indicated by our 11% increase in student appointments and contacts. Although we have filled 5 professional positions and 1 support staff (during the summer, 2006), our average length of employment is around 18 months. Our effort needs to be in retaining these talented individuals.

C. Recommendations:

• Reclassify one of the Grade 39 positions and upgrade it in 07-08.
• In 07-08, provide 1 additional career counselor position in particular to support the growing College of Arts and Sciences.
• Construct a new Student Center with large capacity for Career Fairs, etc. Consider a hotel attached to the Student Center to host our 1,900+ employers who visit our campus and stay over night.
• Restore a past Grade 37 position so that 2 staff can be stationed at the reception desk full time.
Graduation Agreement

A. Findings: A graduation “contract” calls for the university to make all required courses available to the student such that the student will graduate in 4 years by carrying a full course load and passing each course.

The “contract” arrangement was piloted by being offered to 1,000 students in the 16 majors that agreed to participate in the 4-year plan. All colleges, but Design and Education, were involved in the pilot. The program was marketed to students and parents. College advisors received training. The Senate Council was reluctant, and agreed to offer the program for a 3-year pilot period. The pilot period ends after the 06-07 academic year.

Indications: Only 165 students signed up for it. Most were in history, psychology, and biology.

Indiana University at Bloomington had a similar experience with a similar graduation program.

B. Indications: For whatever reasons, there is not much interest in a 4-year graduation agreement. The lack of interest seems to be shared by both parents and students.

C. Recommendations:
   • That the programs be allowed to quietly expire at the end of 06-07
   • That the program be reconsidered and/or modified if there is a significant future parent or student interest.
A. **Findings:** The UK Libraries currently house more than 3 million physical print volumes and we add approximately 75,000 print volumes each year. All of our libraries are currently full. The growth in primary source material, special collections, can be expected to grow by hundreds of linear feet each year. The William T. Young Library’s stack space is already completely full. The group study spaces and classrooms are already inadequate to meet the demands of our current student population. We anticipate opening our first Information Commons in the lower level of Young Library in January. Our facility in the lower level of Young Library is expected to be filled to capacity with the existing student population. There are plans to consolidate 4 science and engineering libraries into the King Library Addition. Funding is still needed and no growth in student population has been built into the planning.

B. **Indications:** As our campus grows in faculty and students, and expands its borders, there will likely be a need for some new libraries or spaces which promote research and study. The most efficient and effective way to storage lesser used print collections is in a storage facility located close but not on central campus. We need Phase 1 of the off-site storage facility NOW. By 2012, it is likely that we will need to store more than 2 million print volumes and thousands of boxes of primary source and archival materials. Phase 2 of the storage facility will be needed by 2012. The M.I. King Library which houses our Special Collections and Digital Programs will need to be renovated. This library houses our digital labs which will be an enormous growth area for us.

C. **Recommendations:**
- Construct Phase 1 of the off-site storage facility by the end of 2007.
- Plan for construction of Phase 2 by 2012.
- Plan for renovation of the King Library Addition into a consolidated Science and Engineering Library by 2008, freeing space in 3 other buildings and repurposing those spaces for academic purposes.
- Build the Health Science Learning Center as planned.
- Investigate concepts such as the Student Learning Center.
- Renovate portions of the Young Library to replace print collections with group study spaces, computers and services.
- Renovate the M.I. King Library to serve as a Special Collections Library. This renovation would include infrastructure such as HVAC but also to provide spaces for students to work on primary source material with appropriate security and supervision.
Multicultural Affairs

A. Findings: Current staff needs an immediate upgrade of their technical and cultural skills in order to handle the increase in student volume and diversity. A critical assessment of the service delivery model and a reorganization of the division are necessary to align it with the immediate needs of the university. As our multicultural population grows, the staff needs to diversify. There is insufficient space to accommodate the additional staff necessary to keep up with enrollment growth. Another first year class the size of this year’s and the situation will be critical.

B. Indications: In order to accomplish retention goals, CARES needs to be moved under one roof in a central campus location to make sure the students it serves are reached. Our employment of students has had to double in order to keep up with the increased work. There are multiple persons in one office space, and staff members are located in offices in other parts of campus. Rapid enrollment growth under conditions of limited resources will contribute to lower quality services.

C. Recommendations:
- Where possible our office needs to be consolidated under one roof.
- We will need more professional staff added to our current office.
- Over the next four years, in order to keep up with the current student growth, our office needs to add between 4 and 6 staff members.
- Our office will need space to house new staff.
A. **Findings:** The University’s current authorized strength of sworn police officers is forty-eight. This translates to a ratio of 1 sworn officer for every 551 students, placing us seventh among our benchmarks. Similarly we have a ratio of 1 sworn officer for every 976 people on campus (faculty, staff and students). This places us eleventh among our benchmarks. We feel that the ideal officer to student ratio is 1:450 while the ideal officer to total population ratio is 1:800. To reach this level would require an additional 10-11 officers, given today’s population, and would place us fourth among our benchmarks in officer to student ratio and seventh in officer to total population ratio. The Headquarters facility for the University Police Department has been located at 305 Euclid Avenue since 1970. The existing police facility is inadequate to meet the current staffing level and the demands of the University community. The facility was originally designed as an apartment building and has been renovated several times in an attempt to meet the growth and needs of the police department. The facility is small (less than 9,000 GSF), not easily accessible to the public and is not ADA compliant. The local and regional police and security industry is experiencing strong competition between agencies for quality employees. This competition has resulted in escalation of salaries and benefits. The University Police salaries were adjusted through a market increase in 2003; however, other agencies have countered this increase since that period. Additionally, retirement benefits for University officers continues to be worse, or at the very least perceived to be worse, than benefits offered at other local and regional agencies. This disparity has been cited as a recruiting and retention obstacle.

B. **Indicators:** The Business Plan’s impact on Police to student ratios can easily be calculated. Failure to increase staff now or to keep pace with growth would take the officer to student ratio from the current rate of 1:551 to 1:703 by 2020. Maintaining the existing ratio of 1:551 would require an additional 13 officers by 2020. To reach the ideal ratio of 1:450 would require an additional 27 officers over this same time period.

C. **Recommendations:**

- In order to maintain our existing officer to student ratio, a minimum of one officer must be added each year over the next fourteen years. Improving our service and response to the community and meeting the recommended target ratio of 1:450, would require the police staffing to be increased by two sworn police officers each year over the next fourteen years.
- A new police or public safety building should be given priority within the capital plan and should be designed to accommodate the anticipated growth targets. An acceptable solution would to be to integrate the police department into a parking structure similar to the structure that houses the Parking and Transportation Department. This would allow the cost per square foot to be considerably lower than a stand-alone building while also not taking up valuable campus physical development space.
- To remain competitive with other local/regional police agencies, we recommend investigating the state police officer hazardous duty retirement system as well as conducting periodic salary market analyses.
- Campus facility growth will require additional security measures particularly in our access control and security camera initiatives. We recommend immediately investigating and establishing a CCTV and Door Access construction standard which would be applied to all future construction.
A. **Findings:** In 2005 the consulting firm of Perkins & Will prepared a full analysis of a revamped and enlarged Student Center as well as a K-Lair satellite. The estimated cost was $127,708,369.

B. **Indications:** Given the high cost of the proposal the plan was placed on hold due to cost, debt requirement and necessary student fee increases.

C. **Recommendations:**

- The University consider a phased approach. The phased approach would cost about $66 million.

- Additional improvements should be considered if the phased approach is delayed. These include major capital improvements to the bookstore under a lease arrangement. Also, the food court could be extensively renovated. Past estimates of an extensive food court renovation were estimated at $1,650,000.
A. **Findings**: Student Employment provides free job referral for UK students to both on and off campus positions. We also manage a Kentucky Work Study program which provides wage reimbursement incentives for employers to hire UK students in jobs related to the student’s field of study. Our goal is to help students earn money to support themselves while they are in school as well as to provide them with meaningful employment which will provide job readiness training and experience to assist them in securing employment after graduation. In FY 06, Student Employment provided 2,616 referral interviews to students. A little under half of those interviews were provide to students who had not used our services (1,109) and the rest of the referral interviews were conducted with return customers (1,507). Student Employment posted 639 positions during that period of time. 529 students were hired into positions posted through our services in FY 06. Their average wage was $9.40 per hour.

B. **Indications**: I would assume an increase in student numbers would increase the number of students seeking employment through our services, requiring more staff hours devoted to both providing referral interviews and marketing Student Employment to University and area employers. As we receive more international students seeking referral, it becomes more important to find University positions for those students since international students cannot work off campus. In general, a more diverse student population means it is increasingly important to find a wide variety of positions that would be attractive to those students and match their schedules and areas of study.

C. **Recommendations**:
- More staff hours and perhaps a better location for interviews during high volume periods like August and September.
- More marketing materials for to solicit jobs for students.
- More materials to market our services to students.
A. **Findings:** For several years, the University Health Service (often called “Student Health”) has operated in crowded space on the first floor of the Ky Clinic. But that is soon to change. A new University Health Building is slated to begin construction soon. Not only will the new design allow efficient handling of patients, it is also designed for a 20% increase in capacity.

B. **Indications:** The soon to be constructed University Health Building will be able to meet the service needs of the expanded student body.

C. **Recommendations:**
   - None; needs will be met with the new building.
A. **Findings:** UKIT is focused on developing a leading technology infrastructure to support student services and transition UK through the changing computing environment to web-based computing. UKIT is also facing a growing demand for student, faculty, and staff support in the web-based computing environment creating needs for more infrastructures, IT staff, and funding. UKIT’s ability to provide up-to-date building networks, adequate support, and more specialized IT needs to departments depends on annual, year-end departmental budget balances. So improvements vary by department and by year, and do not necessarily reflect the actual needs. Thus some departments have the latest technologies, and others function only on a bare bones technology platform. UKIT’s space in McVey hall, as well as the Hospital’s IT space will soon be running at capacity.

B. **Indications:** Support for such services as Blackboard will require an upgrade to 7/24/365 days per year support coverage. Such expansions of service will require more staff and more space, as well as additional training for staff. Additional space would create more flexibility for UKIT to provide the level of support necessary to meet the demands of growing enrollment, as well as alleviate the space issues they currently face. Also, electronic data storage needs are increasing in response to the spread of web-based computing. Issues are rising in the need for increased desktop support, administrative support, research computing, and wireless access. All of these factors cause the need for more funding for staff and their training, additional IT space, and University-wide infrastructure upgrades. UKIT has worked to provide wider-reaching wireless access for students, but access in residence and health care facilities is still limited. UKIT proposed a plan to increase funding to improve wireless conditions, but it was rejected.

C. **Recommendations:**
- Increase IT staffing and staff training
- Expand staff space
- Relocate data center
- Increase funding for:
  - campus wide wireless access
  - voice and data infrastructure
  - upgrading to NLR, or “New Net”
- Consider other funding structures for:
  - life-cycle equipment replacement
  - physical technology upgrades
- Survey other Research 1 institutions for gap analysis
The Writing Center Summary
Full Text in Appendix

A. Findings: The Writing Center is a consulting unit that assists University of
Kentucky students, faculty, and staff with writing projects. The Writing Center is
located on the 5th floor of the W.T. Young Library. In 2005-2006 the Writing
Center saw 29% of the first year students, 50% of other undergraduate students,
20% of the graduate students, and 1% of the faculty. A full quarter of the Center’s
clients claimed English as a second language. During this same period the
Center logged 4,366 consultations, 1,666 more that reported in the 2000 Self-
Study. The success of the Center was accomplished with fewer resources (staff)
and by making the following three adjustments: (1) reinstituted the undergraduate
peer consultant program; (2) returned to a mixture of appointments and drop-ins;
(3) adjusted tutoring to 210 hours per week for the fall semester and 150 per
week for the spring.

B. Indications: The Writing Center has been successful in the past year but the
Center is smaller and more streamlined than national models. The Center is
plagued with under staffing due to a shortage of qualified English graduate
students. The current success can continue into 2006-2007 but additional staff
will be required to meet the needs. It is anticipated that the Center will exceed
capacity soon and during the summer of 2007 an additional Teaching Assistant
and two undergraduate peer tutors will be required to meet the demand. By
2007-2008, the Center will likely need one additional Teaching Assistant and two
more undergraduate peer tutors. By 2011-2012, two additional Teaching
Assistants and three additional undergraduate peer tutors will be required. With
the recent relocation of the Academic Enhancement Program to the Information
Commons, it is anticipated that the Center has adequate space through 2012.

C. Recommendations:

• Develop a space plan/layout of the existing space to accommodate the
  additional Teaching Assistants and undergraduate peer tutors anticipated
  by 2012.

• Fund additional Teaching Assistants and undergraduate peer tutor
  positions to meet the projected service needs of the Center’s clients.
Recommendations – Long Version

A. Recommendations from Committee (expanded wording)
   • Classrooms and class labs
   • Instructional norms
   • Enrollment and Class Size Data
   • Instructional Technology
   • Committee charge, Part II and III
   • Resolution Regarding Space
   • Housing
   • Dining
   • Parking
   • Existing Space Opportunities
   • Capital Construction or Acquisition
   • Community Facilities Required for UK Growth
   • Research Facilities Plan
   • Impact on Support offices

Note: The committee’s ongoing review of recommendations from several campus offices may result in additional recommendations being put forth to the Provost.
Committee Recommendations

Classrooms and class labs

1. That space planning begin immediately to carve out space for an additional introductory Chemistry class lab, while accommodating the needs of displaced functions. Space planning should then be followed by renovation to make the new space available for classes in fall 2008, assuming 07-08 freshmen at 4,000. See also recommendations for a Chem-Phys programming study.

2. That a consultant be immediately hired to conduct a space reprogramming study of the Chemistry-Physics Building to identify methods of accommodating additional Chemistry faculty, student, and research needs for the short term, pending a longer term capital construction solution. The recently conducted VFA condition assessment needs to inform this study. This study must first address solutions for an additional chemistry class lab to be brought on-line by the fall of 2008, as stated above.

3. That the Committee on Effective Instructional Space Utilization be immediately convened, under the direction of a chair, to identify issues and opportunities in effectively utilizing existing classroom space to accommodate increasing enrollment, and to come forward with recommendations to the Provost. Recommendations for the short term should focus on methods to improve classroom seat utilization through more integrated scheduling but without significant adjustments in course design and class patterns. Among other options, the use of contemporary software in class schedule modeling should be considered.

4. That the shelled 165 seat classroom in the basement of the Wethington Building be fit up by fall 2009 and scheduled by the Registrar to meet course needs campus-wide.

5. That any modifications in the current Pharmacy Building to accommodate Biology preserve the two auditoriums for shared classroom use.

6. That large assembly rooms not historically used for scheduled classes, but seating over 150, be made available for one class per semester wherever possible. The Office of Resource Management should work directly with those who schedule the rooms and with the Registrar to identify special needs and limiting factors, identify physical or operational adjustments, and seek solutions on a case-by-case basis. Funding will be needed for adapting such spaces to instructional use, while preserving their original use.

7. That the Physical Development Master Plan update, to be done by ASG in the fall 2006, include the identification of sites for additional 150 seat lecture halls as building expansions or as stand alone facilities.
8. That evening class offerings in introductory Biology continue in order to relieve the pressure there. But begin space planning to create an additional Biology class lab in the Hunt Morgan Building for fall 2009. In addition, Biology’s future occupancy of the vacated Pharmacy Building must be planned so as to relieve pressures on instructional space as enrollment expands.

**Instructional norms**

9. Appoint a task force to study and recommend changes in established norms and perceptions regarding instruction in order to maximize the efficient use of current, as well as future, instructional facilities. Among other topics, this committee should critically review:
   a. the current M W F and T Th scheduling
   b. an evening program in which core courses are offered and provide opportunities to students working during the day
   c. the 75 minute TTh classes in favor of other models
   d. first semester “rescue courses” in the winter intersession to put students back on track
   e. prohibition of MWF classes that do not meet on Fridays
   f. extending peak class hours beyond the 10-3 timeframe
   g. scheduling and conducting additional Friday classes
   h. less convenient classroom assignments, as warranted, to avoid underutilization campus-wide
   i. fewer faculty-imposed limitations placed on schedules for particular classes
   j. establishing a maximum class size for large lectures
   k. making additional college teaching spaces available for campus-wide use, where possible
   l. placing limitations on classes with very irregular or infrequent sessions, such as Discovery and 4-credit hour courses
   m. the use of distance learning technology for course offerings outside the classroom

**Enrollment and Class Size Data**

10. That the annual projections of undergraduate freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior used by this committee be recalculated under different scenarios to better understand the possible effects of trends or influences. Appropriate university offices should maintain this data, update it regularly, and share it with services directly implicated with enrollment.

**Instructional Technology**

11. Utilize technology in creative ways, similar to distance learning, to reduce dependence on classroom and class lab space.
Committee charge, Part II and III

12. That upon satisfactory acceptance of this report, the ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee be approved to proceed with the remaining elements of its original charge: 1.) integrate academic planning for enrollment growth with facilities needs in the Capital Projects planning process, and 2.) update the master Physical Development Plan to reflect current projects, the Top 20 Business Plan, and future initiatives.

Resolution Regarding Space

13. That the Provost issue a written resolution acknowledging that academic space is very limited and is inadequate overall to support current programs and needed growth; that space is an institutional resource and must be utilized by the institution as optimally as possible to meet institutional goals; and that the allocation and use of space should be given the same purposeful effort as the allocation of human resources, operating funds, and capital funds.

Housing

14. That work on the current Housing and Dining Trust Indenture continue in order to allow for more progressive financing plans. Financial options should include a plan to privatize the on-campus construction of approximately 240 beds needed by 2011.

15. That future Capital Plans authorize additional housing.

16. That consideration be given to limiting the non-freshmen in on-campus housing until additional capacity is available. However, it is also recommended that a mix of on-campus housing be maintained such that some students at various class levels can live on campus. There are several reasons why upper classmen need to live on campus.

17. That BCTCS students be limited to 113 beds beginning 2008-09, which is the amount in the master agreement between KCTCS and UK.

Dining

18. That new partnerships be developed with academic colleges and/or other units to build smaller grab-n-go venues, particularly in areas where new construction is being planned. A good example of this would be the new Student Health Center, the new Business School, etc.
19. Continue renovation plans for Blazer Café and other outdated dining facilities with the goal of making all dining facilities a destination, not just a place for students to purchase food and leave.

20. That food service planning consider the impacts of the new Student Center proposal and also consider the development of a new dining facility in a central campus location.

Parking

21. That the update of the campus Physical Development Master Plan respond to the need for additional parking and to the need for alternate means of campus access. Parking will continue to be a problem as the campus population is increased and as additional buildings consume current parking areas. The university will need to work very closely with LFUCG on parking and alternate campus access methods.

Existing Space Opportunities

22. That an assessment process begin to identify certain programs and functions as candidates for relocation to space off-campus. Vacated space would then be reassigned in support of the Top 20 Business Plan, and to programs which remain and expand on campus. The assessment should examine the needs of proposed candidates and make recommendations to ensure reasonable accommodations are provided. Possible candidates may include the McVey Data Center, certain grants and contracts, certain business support functions, and some programs whose off-campus visitors are repeatedly challenged by the on-campus parking situation. UK programs in the Kentucky Utilities building, downtown, and hospital functions on Regency Road are illustrations.

23. That financial and space assignment planning begin immediately to take advantage of some on-campus shelled space to make them available for occupancy and use. These spaces include the K-house 2nd floor, part of the K-house 1st floor, and Little Library 3rd floor shelled space. The assignment of this space and/or the resulting vacated space should be made in the context of campus-wide current, and projected space needs in the context of the Top 20 Business Plan. The shelled space in the Wethington Building is addressed in “classrooms”.

24. That, in addition to shelled space, financial and space assignment planning begin on the Funkhouser tower, Taylor Ed gymnasium, the Office Tower media studio, Cooper House, and Carnahan House to allow the institution to put this space to a higher and better use as enrollment pressures increases. Fire safety deficiencies and current configuration limit the use of these spaces.
25. That the Provost Office of Resource Management expand its efforts in assisting programs with space use alternatives and in identifying the need for renovations and/or equipment investments to increase the benefit of current space.

26. That budgetary planning allocate considerable funds for relocations, renovations, modifications, and furnishings as needed to improve space utilization and to convert "unusable" spaces to office or lab functions.

27. That the centralization of student support offices and services be maintained as an institutional goal. Progress has been made with Funkhouser as the designated location. Centralization of services not only provides a convenience to students and parents, but provides the opportunity for space reduction. The desired redundancy becomes the multi-tasking skills of cross-trained staff, not in space, service centers, equipment, and service locations. The University of Cincinnati’s “One-Stop” student service center is an example.

28. That the Science and Engineering Library consolidation initiative continue to move forward with institutional financial support. Much needed space in the Office Tower, Chem-Phys Building and Anderson Tower will be vacated and made available for reassignment in support of the Top 20 Business Plan.

**Capital Construction or Acquisition**

29. That university capital planning and funding yield the additional research, office, teaching, and support space needed for systematic growth. The new B&E and Law campuses would free up good existing space.

30. That moderate cost capital projects with “2-for-1 space benefits” be given consideration in the upcoming capital planning cycle. Construction projects which free up considerable amounts of good existing space have 2-for-1 space benefits. For example, the amounts and locations of space vacated by an addition to Pence Hall could benefit the teaching, research, and institutional support function of several units. The Library Repository Facility is another such project allowing the institution to convert existing volumes holding space to study and service delivery space.

31. That consideration be given to building acquisitions adjacent to campus or in the Lexington area. Such would allow quick access to additional space and allow leasing funds to be redirected to more productive Top 20 initiatives. Our long-term Lexington leases are a good starting point. Review of programs to move off campus is a second opportunity. Beginning discussions about how the university can assist KCTCS with financing and relocating their BCTC campus near the stadium is yet a third opportunity for building acquisitions. The off campus building(s) needs to be large enough to house a critical mass of UK staff to benefit from synergies of shared support services.
32. That all future buildings on campus go beyond the needs of the initial occupants and respond to the institution’s needs for certain types of space, even in cases where the construction funds involve private or corporate gifts. In some cases, this may require a relaxation of the donor’s restrictions. It may also require design modifications such that more spaces can be shared. Prioritization of buildable space may result in space being dedicated to institutional needs that go beyond the building under review.

33. That consideration be given to construction types that yield more square footage for the dollars and reduce construction time. Michigan and Berkley are two examples of campuses that tailored some of their space expansion methods to their need for fast program growth. The growth detailed in the Top 20 Business Plan will require non-traditional thinking to yield the required square footage within financial realities.

Community Facilities Required for UK Growth

34. That the university immediately co-fund an engineering analysis (UK share approximately $250,000) with LFUCG on options to address sewer capacity in the Wolf Run and Town Branch treatment facilities. This will require LFUCG’s being agreeable to proceed quickly. Secondly, the university must also begin working with the community (Mayor, Council, Commerce Lexington etc.) to educate them about the pending critical nature of this sanitary sewer capacity problem. And thirdly, the university should be prepared to fund a sewer construction assessment from LFUCG to create additional capacity once study is completed. For simple estimating/placeholder purposes only a $2,000,000 amount should be kept in any short term UK financial plan. Until the study is completed, we can not arrive at anything beyond a guess at this point using our history of six years ago as a very rough guide.

Research Facilities Plan

35. That a Task Force be established soon to develop a research facilities growth plan that uses the Top 20 Business Plan as its starting point and goes forward to provide projections of research growth in the various disciplines on campus and in multidisciplinary research initiatives. This research program growth plan would then inform faculty recruitment, core services, space management, and capital planning.

Impact on Support Offices

36. That institutional resource allocation be responsive to the needs of the college student support offices.

37. That the impacts of enrollment expansion on the many campus-wide service offices be considered in planning and implementation.
Issues Deferred

A. Class cancellation due to non-payment of fees
B. Mandatory summer courses
C. Freshmen not allowed to have cars on campus