

# Teaching Space Renovation Priorities

---

## Teaching Space Renovation Joint Subcommittee of Academic Governance

### Technology and IQAS

- Technology: Terry Ettinger, Heidi Webb (chair)
- IQAS: Melissa Fierke, Jonathon Owens, Mary Thompson

## Contents

Student Perspective .....	3
Committee’s Charge .....	3
Process .....	3
Room Usage.....	4
Room Status and Availability .....	4
Public Opinion .....	4
Campus Survey: Faculty, Staff, Graduate Students .....	4
USA and GSA meetings .....	4
Short survey targeting undergraduates.....	4
Safety.....	5
Rubric .....	5
Widespread Comments .....	5
Crowded or Underutilized Rooms .....	5
Wireless .....	6
Instructor Computers .....	6
Chairs & Furniture .....	6
Heating .....	7
Classrooms .....	7
Illick 5.....	7
Marshall Auditorium.....	7
Moon 19 .....	8
Marshall 212.....	9

Illick 16.....	9
Walter 210.....	9
Marshall 319.....	10
Walter 211.....	10
Bray 313.....	10
Teaching Laboratories .....	10
Marshall 409.....	11
Illick 410/414 .....	11
Illick 309.....	11
Walter 102.....	11
Marshall B13.....	11
Illick Labs as Whole.....	11
Marshall Studios .....	12
Teaching Spaces at Remote Sites .....	13
Future Recommendation – Campus Walk.....	13
Appendix A: Room Usage Totals.....	14
Appendix B: Survey Questions.....	17
Appendix C: Rubric to determine renovation priorities .....	19
Appendix D: Rubric Applied to Classrooms Spaces .....	21
Appendix E: Rubric applied to non-classroom teaching spaces .....	22

## Student Perspective

*“Sometimes lack of updates and renovation can make a classroom seem dark, sad and make it a less efficient learning environment. Also turns off incoming students.” ~ Student*

*“I think that the most important reason to renovate a teaching space is to ensure that the space is the best possible learning environment. Old classrooms with dim lights, no air conditioning, dim projectors, uncomfortable chairs, desks that are too small etc. make it difficult to stay focused on the lecture, take notes, and learn.” ~ Student*

*“updated classrooms, whether it's new technology or new desks, when done correctly can significantly improve the learning environment and allow for the most efficient flow of information to students.” ~ Student*

When asked which room to renovate first, one student suggested: *“try to focus on the main rooms for each department”*

## Committee's Charge

~ from the Provost's Office

1. Create prioritized list of classrooms needing renovation
2. Create prioritized list of teaching labs that need renovation
3. Develop the criteria by which prioritization is determined
4. Develop and implement a process that allows input from all faculty (and possibly students)

## Process

This committee focused on:

- Room Usage
- Room Status and Availability
- Public Opinion
  - Campus Survey: Faculty, Staff, Graduate Students
  - USA and GSA meetings
  - Short survey targeting undergraduates
- Rubric to Determine Renovation Priority

## Room Usage

Room usage was determined by comparing class enrollments and where those classes were scheduled. A look at room reservations within the ESF spaces system was also considered. These data are found in Appendix A.

## Room Status and Availability

The availability of a room to the entire campus through the ESF Spaces system was taken into consideration. At least one member of the committee physically visited each teaching space to assess the condition, size, number of seats, layout, and anything else that was noteworthy.

## Public Opinion

### **Campus Survey: Faculty, Staff, Graduate Students**

An 11 question survey (Appendix B) was sent out through Campus News and the graduate student email discussion lists on campus using Qualtrics survey software. 148 people responded to the entire survey. 80% of respondents actively teach or perform instruction in campus teaching spaces. 46% of respondents were faculty, 20% were staff, and 34% were graduate students. Responses from this survey informed many aspects of this report.

### **USA and GSA meetings**

A committee member attended both a USA and a GSA meeting to gauge undergraduate and graduate student opinions on teaching space renovations and get their feedback on getting feedback from other students. The graduate students received the campus survey. The undergraduates were targeted for a short 3 question survey in addition to the comments received during the USA meeting.

### **Short survey targeting undergraduates**

A three questions survey (below) was created through Google Forms and advertised to undergraduates in the bread line, within the library, and on Facebook. The gathered comments are used throughout this report.

Survey Questions:

1. Are you an ESF student?
2. What do you think is the most important reason to renovate a teaching space?

3. If you had to pick one classroom or teaching lab to renovate/upgrade, which one would you choose and why?

## Safety

Just briefly, safety was considered when prioritizing renovations but was not included as a primary factor when considering which room to renovate for two reasons. One, the campus community rated other factors as more important, and two, after a conversation with the Chief of the University Police Department, it was apparent that safety improvements are a case by case basis and would be easier to address when rooms are renovated. The two most important factors to consider being:

1. The door
  - a. Lockable from the inside
  - b. Two doors are better than one
  - c. Windowless doors are preferable to ones with windows
2. Means of notification
  - a. Location of the phone
  - b. Presence of the emergency notification icon on the computer

In the future, the capitol planning committee should engage the UPD when necessary.

## Rubric

Based on campus feedback, a rubric was created (Appendix C) to determine renovation priorities. This method was used so that many factors could be considered at once and to create a way to assess rooms in the future.

Appendices D and E show the results for classrooms and laboratories, respectively, when applied to the rubric.

## Widespread Comments

### Crowded or Underutilized Rooms

There were several comments regarding rooms feeling crowded because of high enrollment or empty because the rooms were being used by a class much smaller than the room's capability. These observations are supported by enrollment numbers and comparing those numbers to the room size.

Some of these issues may be addressed in the upcoming schedule reset or in new ways of assigning rooms to classes.

## Wireless

*“Any room on the 3rd floor of Bray. The internet access is poor, and our professor struggles to share assignments or have us work on projects because the internet does not reach. Most, if not all classes require technology, and it is very limited in Bray Hall.” ~Undergraduate Student*

*“the fact that we don't have wifi in a main building on a college campus in the year 2016 is beyond ridiculous.” ~Graduate Student referring to Illick*

Based on the types and amount of comments (55 in total) received regarding wireless internet, wireless is expected in all teaching spaces. Bray and Illick were the most frequently mentioned buildings and for some teaching spaces, the lack of wireless was the main complaint. In addition, some rooms do not have the capacity to handle internet usage for their largest enrollments. This is particularly true with Marshall Auditorium.

Since wireless might not be a room specific technology, the lack of wireless was not considered when rating classrooms with the rubric.

## Instructor Computers

*“I have to bring my own laptop and connector to class in Marshall. It's inconvenient and physically problematic, given everything else I have to carry. The connection is sketchy.” ~Faculty*

*“I have yet to hook my laptop up to the teaching station in 111 Marshall. Attempts have wasted precious class minutes.” ~Faculty*

Should all classrooms have a teaching computer in the room? There are several that do not and therefore instructors need to bring a laptop capable of connecting with a VGA cable. Not only would a computer be more convenient for faculty (who often have to purchase their own equipment) but also for students who would like to use the room or have a presentation.

## Chairs & Furniture

The older chair/arm desk combos are generally disliked because of their small size, small writing area, and grade school classroom vibe. The aspects they do have going for them are that they can easily be moved around and they are generally in ok condition.

There were also multiple comments regarding immovable furniture and thus a desire for flexible seating and configurations. This would allow for different types of group work, class formats, and other things. In the campus survey in order to gauge how different classrooms

would be from current classrooms, respondents were asked what their ideal classroom would be (Question 5, Appendix B). There are some insightful responses and planning teams going forward should take a look at these ideals. The two most common responses were either auditorium style or smaller rooms with flexible seating and all classrooms should have wifi, good sound and projection equipment as well as whiteboards or blackboards.

## Heating

In the older buildings, specifically Bray, Marshall, Walters, and Illick, there were multiple comments regarding temperatures getting too hot. In the first three, the comments centered around comfort and the resulting ability to pay attention in class and / or the sustainability of such high temperatures. In Illick, comments also mentioned that high and fluctuating temperatures can wreak havoc on experiments.

## Classrooms

### *Prioritized List of Classrooms*

1. Illick 5
2. Marshall Auditorium
3. Moon 19
4. Marshall 212
5. Illick 16
6. Walter 210
7. Marshall 319
8. Walter 211
9. Bray 313

### **Illick 5**

It is good that Illick 5 is slated for renovation. Through all the feedback mechanisms, 20 commenters specifically called out Illick 5 as a renovation priority or their least favorite room on campus. Multiple comments involved uncomfortable seats, damaged and dated decor, issues with the speakers, terrible lighting, and screens that were too small for everyone in the room to see adequately. In addition, when the rubric was applied to Illick 5, it clearly landed in the top 3 classrooms in most need of renovation.

### **Marshall Auditorium**

*“Marshall Auditorium is lacking in necessary amenities for lecturing such as, say, desks”*

*~Undergraduate Student*

*“there is no lecture hall large enough during the scheduled time in the spring semester - we've moved to SU's campus.” ~Graduate Student*

*“The students are wrongly expected to write notes and exams without any sort of desk. Impossible!!” ~Faculty*

*“Marshall Auditorium should not be a classroom.” ~Faculty*

*“We need a big teaching space to handle the big classes, and one that is far superior to Marshall Auditorium or Illick 5.” ~ Faculty*

A lot of the problems with Marshall Auditorium stem from the fact that it is designed to be a performance space that is currently the most heavily used “classroom” on campus. Smaller classes could be relocated elsewhere but Marshall Auditorium is the only space on campus for classes/sections larger than 157 (the current capacity of Illick 5).

Some specific concerns with Marshall Auditorium:

- Lacks writing surfaces
- 23 negative comments specifically addressing the auditorium as a classroom
- Technology. Technology is bound to have issues in a room that is used so frequently; particularly the audio. Even though the space was designed to be a performance space, the audio is still really important as classes edge towards 100 and even 200.
- There is not enough wireless capabilities for classes in this room.
- The audience seating layout puts students in very close proximity during exams and students in the front row wings can't see the screen.

Granted, some people pointed out that unique activities can happen with a stage and aisles but overall this room is not suited to be a large lecture style classroom.

## **Moon 19**

*“My first class was in moon 19 and the room depressed me so much it ruined the rest of my day. I can't say exactly what it was, but it felt like a dungeon.” ~ Undergraduate Student*

*“Aesthetics, technology, and furniture are all quite literally falling apart and ratty. This room has potential and is a good size, but everything in it is trash.” ~Faculty*



*"I'm almost embarrassed to show visitors Moon 19. It looks like ESF doesn't care. The furniture is trash. The technology struggles to work." ~ Staff*

Moon 19 is a room with lots of potential. It's a good size and has lots of chalkboards and whiteboards. However, as the comments above illustrate, there is general discontent with the room overall. It could use an entire makeover: built-in technology, new furniture, fresh paint, and a super cleaned or new carpet.

## **Marshall 212**

*Marshall 212 is poorly setup for both viewing the main screen (screen in the middle of a long wall makes the peripheral seats useless). ~Faculty*

Marshall 212 ranks so high in the list because of its extremely high usage and accessibility concerns. While the room is fairly large and can currently hold about 75 students, the layout and fixed seating prevent all students from seeing the screens and boards. At the beginning of the academic year, the room also had broken furniture, but that has since been fixed.

## **Illick 16**

*"Illick 16: you can't hear & the ventilation is very poor" ~ Undergraduate Student*

*"Illick 16: you can't hear over the equipment in the back + whiteboard on the side"  
~Undergraduate Student*

Illick 16 is used frequently, holds about 40 students, and aesthetically speaking it's not the most unpleasant room on campus. However, there are complaints that it's difficult to hear the instructor and others in the classroom especially when equipment both in the room and in the bowels of Illick are operating.

## **Walter 210**

*"Walters 210 and 211 have screens that are so small, that I would only teach in there if I didn't want to use technology. I can't see the screens, so I wouldn't expect students to be able to". ~ Staff*

Walters 210 is used frequently and can hold around 30 students. It also received mixed reviews of individuals who really like and really dislike this room. The main concerns in this room are the small computer screen in the front of the room and the small desk chair combos.

## **Marshall 319**

*“dated, floors in poor condition, student seating areas in poor condition” ~Staff*

*Landscape Architecture desperately needs a good presentation and lecture room. Our studios also desperately need to be updated. It is so bad we are losing potential students because of it.  
~Faculty*

*Seating uncomfortable, technology dated, lighting inadequate, no electricity at student seats...look at room 319 Marshall and you will see it has not been rehabed since 1968. ~Faculty*

Marshall 319 is also a high use room on campus and has a capacity for about 60 students. Not only is it dated in appearance but the floor tiles are starting to warp. In addition, the space has not kept up with the changing nature of the department most likely to use the room due to location (Landscape Architecture). Being the one department on campus that requires students to have their own laptop, yet no mechanism to charge the laptop during a long class is just one example of how the space does not fully meet current needs.

## **Walter 211**

Walter 211 is similar to Walter 210 mentioned earlier, except that it has a slightly larger capacity of about 50 students. It ranked lower than 210 primarily because less people indicated that they were dissatisfied with this room.

## **Bray 313**

Bray 313 holds about 50 students. Due to fire code regulations and the location of the door, all the desks are pushed to the back of the room resulting in complaints that the room feels crowded. The desk chair combos are also unpopular. If different furniture or a different layout would work within the fire code, those changes would go a long way in this room.

## **Teaching Laboratories**

### *Prioritized List of Laboratories*

1. Marshall 409
2. Illick 410/414
3. Illick 309
4. Walter 102
5. Marshall B13
6. Illick Labs as Whole
7. Marshall Studios

## **Marshall 409**

*409 Marshall needs to be first on anyone's list of priorities. It is used constantly, but is very substandard. ~Faculty*

Marshall 409 / Jury Crit Room ranked very high in the rubric because it is grudgingly being used as a classroom in addition to its original intent as a room for critiquing designs. That is why the technology is cobbled together on a crash cart and the seating consists of just seats and no desk space. Regardless of the room's intent, the acoustics and ventilation still remain a concern.

## **Illick 410/414**

Illick 410 and 414 are lumped together because they are similar rooms that are often used for similar laboratories and can be accessed by doors within the rooms and not just by using the hallway. Overall, these two rooms top the list because of their high usage; complaints that the desks wobble and are too small for some students; lack of more than one working fume hood; and that the location of the air vents prevent anyone from doing sterile experiments.

## **Illick 309**

Illick 309 is also used by a high number of students and concerns with this room include: wobbly furniture; a layout that inhibits movement; no built in projection equipment, outlets, or extra Ethernet ports; lack of desired DI water; and aesthetics.

## **Walter 102**

Concerns with Walter 102 include outdated technology that doesn't match technology used in the professional world, aesthetics, and a general concern over building temperature.

## **Marshall B13**

Concerns with Marshall B13 generally involve the room being a small, crowded, and poorly ventilated space that is also used for storage and has old furniture. This room also topped the list of most disliked teaching labs.

## **Illick Labs as Whole**

*"Some classrooms and labs are cluttered with unstored teaching materials that get in the way - some of which are apparently no longer used and instead just legacy mess. Many are dirty. The projection systems consistently have issues. Some classrooms in Illick are very noisy due to the ventilation and plumbing systems." ~Graduate Student*

*“Classrooms are generally adequate and I know there are plans to upgrade many of the issues mentioned such as wireless access (Illick is just a problem!) / Labs are another matter and it's not that my needs are unmet. I have figured out, as I assume most of us have, where to find what we need and how to make do. It's the condition of the labs that is driving me nuts! The lab benches are cracked and sometimes wobbly and falling apart. The bottom was falling out of several of the drawers making them unavailable for storing anything until they were glued back together. Storage space is inadequate so often many things have to be removed in order to find one thing. Projection screens are dilapidated. And carts are often so decrepit that one worries about the specimens while trying to move them.” ~Staff*

There were a lot of comments directed generically at Illick and Illick teaching laboratories as a whole. These include:

- No wifi and few ethernet ports
- Not enough storage for lab equipment
- Projection systems/screens are in poor condition or absent entirely
- Damaged and wobbly furniture
- Cramped and crowded rooms (One person suggested adding more lab sections or building bigger labs)
- Improper room assignments for class sizes
- Temperature fluctuations interfere with experiments and human comfort
- Poor aesthetics
- Not enough or no fume hoods
- No distilled water lines
- Not enough room for student belongings during class
- Old equipment
- Building and equipment is dirty and dusty

It is recommended that the current and future needs of EFB be analyzed and considered in conjunction with the schedule reset and the new ARB building when tackling the remaining rooms in Illick.

## **Marshall Studios**

Marshall studios should be considered over the newer Baker and Jahn labs for several reasons including the fact that Marshall studios ranked lower than some labs in Baker only because the Baker labs are available to the entire community and are sometimes treated more like classrooms than “teaching laboratories.”

The common theme regarding the studios in Marshall is reorganization. Comments relayed that at times the organization of the space and furniture which are a mismatched collection of repurposed computer desks doesn't adequately hold the number of students needed. And while the studios didn't make the top of the priority list, a rethinking of furniture and layout would make a huge visual and practical improvement. Also, a desire for more pinup areas was expressed.

## Teaching Spaces at Remote Sites

Very little feedback was received regarding teaching spaces at remote sites and without the advantage of seeing most of these sites in person, it is difficult to access these spaces and apply the rubric to them. However, two sites were mentioned specifically and are worth noting.

1. Heiberg Classrooms
  - a. These are already in the process of renovation.
2. Animal Studies Lab at Newcomb Campus
  - a. *“Speaking specifically about the Newcomb Campus, the Animal Studies Lab is vastly out of date and needs renovation (this is in discussion). This teaching space needs to be very flexible to accommodate many different ESF classes' needs as well as other universities and groups who use the space for teaching and laboratory work. It also needs upgraded storage for materials.” ~Faculty*

## Future Recommendation – Campus Walk

One recommendation supported by the USA representatives is to hold a re-occurring perhaps yearly campus walk through of teaching spaces to discover potential new issues and identify small changes that could make a huge impact. It could be open to the entire community or a small group of individuals representing students, faculty and staff.

## Appendix A: Room Usage Totals

Average Per Semester during Spring 2013 - Spring 2015 terms (4 Semesters total)

Building	Room	Scheduled Classes Per Week	Student Enrollment Per Semester	Number of Courses Scheduled Per Semester	Events Scheduled in ESF Spaces
<b>Baker</b>	<b>105</b>	3	45	2	0
	<b>106</b>	1	21	1	0
	<b>141</b>	26	190	15	55
	<b>145</b>	43	565	25	55
	<b>146</b>	39	790	22	74
	<b>148</b>	34	493	18	37
	<b>154</b>	19	114	9	0
	<b>159</b>	24	160	10	0
	<b>184</b>	1	13	1	0
	<b>230</b>	3	8	2	0
	<b>234</b>	1	3	1	0
	<b>309</b>	13	274	11	89
	<b>310</b>	5	34	4	115
	<b>314</b>	9	119	7	112
	<b>315</b>	1	2	0	0
	<b>431</b>	1	11	1	0
	<b>432</b>	15	146	10	30
	<b>433</b>	0	3	0	0
	<b>434</b>	10	56	5	77
<b>437</b>	11	133	7	94	
	<b>RTBA</b>	1	37	1	0
<b>Bray</b>	<b>217</b>	0	0	0	206
	<b>300</b>	8	96	6	43
	<b>301</b>	1	4	0	0
	<b>313</b>	20	262	13	51
	<b>314</b>	1	8	1	0
	<b>315</b>	25	133	13	27
	<b>321</b>	24	280	12	60
	<b>324</b>	3	13	3	0
	<b>416</b>	1	2	1	0
<b>Centennial</b>	<b>G023</b>	9	62	3	0
	<b>RTBA</b>	1	9	1	0

Building	Room	Scheduled Classes Per Week	Student Enrollment Per Semester	Number of Courses Scheduled Per Semester	Events Scheduled in ESF Spaces
<b>Gateway</b>	<b>237</b>	0	1	0	0
<b>Illick</b>	<b>5</b>	43	854	22	114
	<b>8</b>	3	32	3	0
	<b>11</b>	4	20	2	65
	<b>12</b>	9	64	6	0
	<b>16</b>	21	169	11	37
	<b>112</b>	5	55	4	0
	<b>117</b>	5	93	6	0
	<b>122</b>	1	35	2	0
	<b>215</b>	1	5	1	0
	<b>220</b>	6	79	3	0
	<b>238</b>	12	176	11	0
	<b>251</b>	3	52	3	0
	<b>306</b>	4	76	5	0
	<b>309</b>	6	143	6	0
	<b>313</b>	5	91	5	0
	<b>314</b>	7	156	7	0
	<b>315</b>	0	5	0	0
	<b>334</b>	7	66	7	0
	<b>410</b>	5	85	5	0
	<b>414</b>	12	227	12	0
	<b>424</b>	3	20	3	0
	<b>530</b>	2	4	1	0
	<b>RTBA</b>	1	15	2	0
<b>Jahn</b>	<b>122</b>	3	11	2	0
	<b>130</b>	7	123	7	0
	<b>136</b>	1	9	1	0
	<b>137</b>	2	14	2	0
	<b>138</b>	9	242	9	0
<b>Marshall</b>	<b>101</b>	1	4	0	0
	<b>103</b>	5	39	2	0
	<b>105</b>	1	12	1	0
	<b>110</b>	18	116	11	57
	<b>111</b>	25	264	14	44
	<b>209</b>	2	13	1	0

Building	Room	Scheduled Classes Per Week	Student Enrollment Per Semester	Number of Courses Scheduled Per Semester	Events Scheduled in ESF Spaces
	212	32	385	17	27
	214	1	12	0	0
	217	2	6	3	0
	303	2	25	3	0
	316	3	28	1	0
	317	3	10	1	0
	319	20	293	13	27
	327	6	31	5	0
	408	3	24	2	0
	409	11	108	8	0
	412	7	7	4	0
	103A	2	5	1	0
	316A	3	16	2	0
	316S	1	3	1	0
	410	4	24	1	0
	Aud	64	1215	28	26
	B13	3	59	3	0
	B9	1	1	1	0
	RTBA	3	26	2	0
<b>Moon</b>	19	11	71	5	179
	110	13	103	7	237
<b>Walter</b>	102/LAB	8	45	5	0
	210	25	152	15	33
	211	29	248	17	35
	323	1	5	1	0
	RTBA	1	16	1	0
<b>Grand Total</b>		837	10362	518	2001



## Appendix B: Survey Questions

For the purpose of this survey:

Teaching labs are laboratories where teaching is the primary focus. These spaces are assigned for classes through the registrar and are typically equipped to conduct scientific experiments, tests, investigations, etc.

Classrooms are all remaining rooms where students are taught.

1) Do you teach or perform instruction in campus classrooms or labs? Y / N

2) Are you: Faculty   Staff   Student

3) What buildings do you teach in?

Illick, Marshall, Gateway, Bray, Jahn, Baker, Moon, Walters, Building off main campus (where?)

4) If you could put the perfect classroom/lab anywhere, what buildings would you be willing to teach in?

Illick, Marshall, Gateway, Bray, Jahn, Baker, Moon, Walters, Building off main campus (where?)

5a) What does your ideal classroom look like?

5b) What is your ideal teaching lab space?

6a) Overall, how well do classrooms and teaching labs meet your current needs?

Not at all | Slightly | Well | Very Well

6b) why / why not

7) What are the classrooms / teaching labs you are most happy with? List of buildings with open text to fill in room numbers → directions explain

7b) Why (e.g. aesthetics, technology, furniture, size)?

8) What are the classrooms / teaching labs you are least happy with?

List of buildings with open text to fill in room numbers → directions explain

8b) Why (e.g. aesthetics, technology, furniture, size)?

9) What factors do you think are most important to consider when choosing to renovate / upgrade a **classroom**?

*Rank in order by dragging → directions explain*

furniture

lighting

electrical service and outlets

internet / WiFi access

writing surfaces

existing technology/equipment

layout

physical environment (ventilation, heat/cool, water, etc.)

Physical aesthetics (paint, flooring, etc)

access and security

acoustics

other

10) What factors do you think are most important to consider when choosing to renovate / upgrade a **teaching lab**?

*Rank in order by dragging → directions explain*

furniture

lighting

electrical service and outlets

internet / WiFi access

writing surfaces

existing technology/equipment

layout

physical environment (ventilation, heat/cool, water, etc.)

Physical aesthetics (paint, flooring, etc)

access and security

acoustics

other

11) Do you have any other comments regarding specific classrooms and/or teaching labs? Make sure to indicate which room(s) you are referring to.

## Appendix C: Rubric to determine renovation priorities

\*General complaints regarding the entire building are noted elsewhere.

FACTORS	HIGHEST PRIORITY (3)	MEDIUM PRIORITY (2)	LOWER PRIORITY (1)
<b>Availability</b>	Available to the entire campus through the campus reservation system	Available through the campus reservation system with preference to specific departments	Available only to individuals within a specific department
<b>Usage</b>	Room falls within one of the following usage ranges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Room has over 30 class sessions per week during a semester.</li> <li>- More than 300 students are enrolled in classes assigned to that room per semester</li> <li>- The room is used for over 100 events per semester.</li> </ul>	Room does not meet criteria under highest priority and falls within one the following usage ranges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Room has 15-29 class sessions per week during a semester.</li> <li>- 100-299 students are enrolled in classes assigned to that room per semester</li> <li>- Room is scheduled for 50-99 events per semester.</li> </ul>	Room does not meet any criteria under highest or medium priorities and falls within one the following usage ranges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Room has less than 10 class sessions per week during a semester.</li> <li>- Less than 100 students are enrolled in classes assigned to that room per semester</li> <li>- Room is scheduled for less than 50 events per semester or is not available through ESF spaces.</li> </ul>
<b>Technology</b>	Technology present does not meet the needs of current classes. This includes lack of desired technologies, and technology that has a reputation of being unreliable. Insufficient wireless for the room is noted elsewhere and not part of this rubric.	Technology in the room is nearing its end of life cycle or desired technologies such as a computer for the instructor do not exist.	Technology equipment is in good working order and is relatively new.
<b>Furnishings</b>	Furnishings are broken, dilapidated and in need of repair or furnishings like writing surfaces do not exist.	Furnishings are missing, approaching the end of their usable life, cannot accommodate a wide range of body sizes, writing surfaces are inadequate, and/or furnishings no longer match the use of the room.	Furnishings are functional, safe, and in good repair.

<b>Accessibility / Layout</b>	Screen size/location and/or acoustics make it difficult for students to fully participate in class. Instructor and student mobility is severely inhibited when in use.	Screen size/location and/or acoustics could be improved but do not prevent student learning. Instructor and student mobility is not inhibited but also is not easily achieved when in use.	Room meets the needs of vision, hearing, and mobility impaired. Instructor and students can move easily around the room when in full use.
<b>Physical Environment</b>	Ventilation, heating, equipment, plumbing, fume hoods, etc. are unreliable and/ or pose a safety hazard.	Ventilation, heating, equipment, plumbing, fume hoods, etc. may interfere with student learning and could use improvement but are generally not considered safety hazards.	Systems are functional, safe, and in good repair. They do not interfere with student learning.
<b>Other Factors Lighting Outlets Physical Aesthetics</b>	Room has complaints about 2 or more of these other factors. Room is poorly lit, does not have adequate outlets for the room's typical usage, and/or the room's aesthetics are referred to in a negative manner.	Room has complaints about less than 2 of these other factors. Room is poorly lit, does not have adequate outlets for the room's typical usage, and/or the room's aesthetics are referred to in a negative manner.	Room has adequate lighting and outlets for the room's typical usage. The room's aesthetics do not detract from learning.
<b>Demand</b>	More than 10 comments expressed interest in renovating a particular room or that the room was their least favorite on campus.	Between 5 and 10 comments expressed interest in renovating a particular room or that the room was their least favorite on campus.	Fewer than five comments expressed interest in renovating a particular room or that the room was their least favorite on campus.

## Appendix D: Rubric Applied to Classrooms Spaces

Building	Room	Lab or Classroom	Availability	Usage	Technology	Furnishings	Accessibility /Layout	Physical Environment	Other Factors	Demand	Total	
Marshall	Aud	C	3	3	2	3	3	2	1	3	20	
Moon	19	C	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	20	
Illick	5	C	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	20	Slated for Renovation
Marshall	212	C	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	2	17	
Illick	16	C	3	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	16	
Walter	210	C	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	16	
Bray	313	C	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	15	
Marshall	319	C	3	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	15	
Walter	211	C	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	15	
Baker	145	C	3	3	2	1	1	2	1	1	14	
Baker	146	C	3	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	14	
Marshall	110	C	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	14	
Marshall	111	C	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	14	
Bray	315	C	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	13	
Baker	148	C	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	
Bray	321	C	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	12	
Moon	110	C	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	
Illick	334	Conference / C	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	12	
Baker	141	C	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	
Baker	432	C	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	
Bray	300	C	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	11	Recently Renovated
Centennial	G023	C	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	10	
Illick	12	C	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	10	
Illick	8	C	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	
Marshall	327	Conference	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	9	
Bray	314	Conference / C	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	9	
Bray	324	Conference / C	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	9	
Marshall	105	Conference / C	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	9	
Baker	105	C	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	
Gateway	237	C	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	
Baker	254	Conference	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	
Jahn	122	Conference	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	
Walter	323	Conference	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	

## Appendix E: Rubric applied to non-classroom teaching spaces

Building	Room	Lab or Classroom	Availability	Usage	Technology	Furnishings	Accessibility /Layout	Physical Environment	Other Factors
Illick	309	L	1	2	2	1	2	2	1
Illick	414	L	1	2	1	2	1	2	2
Baker	159	L	3	2	1	1	1	1	1
Illick	314	L	1	2	1	3	1	1	1
Illick	410	L	1	1	1	2	1	2	2
Walter	102/LAB	L	1	1	3	1	1	2	1
Marshall	B13	L	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
Illick	117	L	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Illick	238	L	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Illick	424	L	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Jahn	130	L	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Jahn	138	L	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Marshall	217	L	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Baker	106	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Baker	184	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Baker	230	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Baker	234	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Illick	112	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Illick	122	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Illick	220	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Illick	251	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Illick	306	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Illick	313	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Illick	530	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Jahn	137	L	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Baker	154	PC	3	2	1	1	2	1	1
Baker	310	PC	3	3	1	1	1	1	1
Baker	314	PC	3	3	1	1	1	1	1
Baker	309	PC	3	2	1	1	1	1	1
Baker	434	PC	3	2	1	1	1	1	1
Baker	437	PC	3	2	1	1	1	1	1
Marshall	303	PC	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Marshall	409	Studio	1	2	2	3	2	2	2
Marshall	103	Studio	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Marshall	209	Studio	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Marshall	316	Studio	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Marshall	317	Studio	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Marshall	408	Studio	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Marshall	412	Studio	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Marshall	103A	Studio	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Marshall	316A	Studio	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Marshall	410E & W	Studio	1	1	1	1	1	2	1