



**RICE UNIVERSITY**

**SPACE TASK FORCE REPORT**

October 27, 2013

## Introduction

The Rice campus has grown from just over 3 million gross square feet of built space in 2000 to its current size of almost 5.5 million gross square feet. And yet, the ability of the university to meet the growing and changing space needs of the university is increasingly problematic. Rice needs clearly articulated principles, standards, processes, and tools to more effectively and efficiently allocate space.

In addition, the cost for operating, maintaining, and equipping space is increasing due to the growth of built space on campus, and inflation. In most cases, these expenses are not visible to, or borne by, the department or group that occupies that space, thus providing little incentive to optimize utilization.

More information and analysis is needed to understand how space is being utilized across campus. For example, do we have sufficient visibility into how research space is being used and principles for its allocation? How can we use classroom space for other purposes when not employed as instructional space? What principles and practices would ensure the most effective allocation of office space? These are only a few examples of the issues to be considered.

At the request of the Provost the Space Task Force was created. The charter directs the task force to recommend improvements to standards, practices and processes impacting all Rice-owned space; benchmark peer institutions to determine standards, decision processes, and best practices; and develop strategic approaches and processes to improve the use of existing space and increase Rice's ability to leverage space opportunities as they arise.

The report of the task force follows.

# Benchmarking Peer Institutions

## Benchmarking Process

The committee selected the following schools for interviews:

- Carnegie Mellon University
- Princeton University
- Stanford University
- University of California, Berkeley
- University of Michigan
- University of Notre Dame

The schools selected, although larger than Rice, have strong academic standing and significant research programs. Each of the six schools participated in a one-hour guided discussion around four themes: standards, tools, decision process, and effectiveness. Although not interviewed, additional information was obtained from MIT and the University of Southern California.

In addition, the real estate practices of several additional universities were benchmarked.

## Peer Institution Practices

### Space Standards

The majority of institutions employ standards for allocating space. Recognizing that standards are difficult to apply retroactively, they are generally applied to new buildings or renovations.

### Ownership and Management of Space

Every institution explicitly states that the Provost or President owns all space. In practice, day-to-day management of space is delegated to schools, departments, or administrative units. The Registrar manages instructional space, with instructional labs scheduled by departments.

### Infrastructure

All schools benchmarked struggle with establishing and maintaining the infrastructure required for effective space management. All institutions have dedicated senior staff member(s) in the Provost or facilities planning office and utilize software packages for space management and financial reporting. However, no institution reports effective integration of software packages or dashboards to present information. Reporting tools are limited to packaged reports, often linked to space allocation or cost recovery. All schools believe departments should understand the real cost of maintaining and operating space by reporting that cost to them annually.

## **Decision Process**

The process for allocating space varies widely between institutions from a formal committee structure to one school that described their process as “sitting down and discussing the issues over a cup of coffee.” At a minimum, the information required consistently includes the academic justification, cost and budget impact, and internal or external benchmarks. The majority of schools also hold interviews to define the facility and infrastructure issues associated with the request. An exception to criteria or guidelines is managed on an ad-hoc basis by the Provost, or is delegated to an appointee or committee.

## **Research Space**

### **Productivity and Space Allocation**

At the benchmarked institutions there is a link between research productivity and space allocation, but no single formulaic model. Schools recognize wide variances between academic disciplines and the nature of the research, balanced against the need for quantifiable research productivity measures. Most measure research productivity at the school or department level according to internal metrics such as research expenditures per assignable square foot, or number of researchers, post docs, and graduate students per assignable square foot.

A common practice is an annual space review. At one university Deans and senior academic administrators perform an annual assessment to identify underutilized research space based on quantitative metrics including research expenditures, recovered indirect costs, research group size, and additional factors (e.g., future plans, overall trend in funding, recent awards, continuity of space, continuity of unique facilities or research capabilities, and sabbaticals). Underutilized space may be reassigned.

### **Tools to Increase Utilization**

The most common methods employed to increase research space utilization are productivity or utilization measurements linked to space requests, overhead charges linked to cost recovery or maintenance and operational (M&O) expenses, and annual budget or planning discussions, usually with the provost, that link space allocation to budget and productivity measures. Several schools suggest increasing awareness of the cost of space, as well as increased transparency of data, to encourage greater efficiency.

One school has employed a system of implied rent to create a marketplace for space. The school is ending this policy, finding limited benefits and a variety of unintended consequences such as wealthy schools or departments buying space and instances of gaming the marketplace to reallocate poorly located or lower quality space.

## Instructional Space

### Utilization Goals

The majority of schools have specific utilization goals for general-purpose classrooms, most commonly based on a percentage of available hours (e.g. 65% to 75% of available hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.). Schools consistently struggle with low utilization in two areas: non-peak hours and departmentally controlled instructional areas.

### Tools to Increase Utilization

Universities use a variety of means to increase utilization of instructional space, commonly involving methods to maximize space scheduled by the Registrar. Many schools limit the number of classes that departments can schedule between 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. Other methods include allocation of maintenance and operation expenses (M&O) to incentivize departments to convert space to Registrar control, or the opposite tactic – increased funding for instructional technology or other space improvements for rooms that are turned over to the Registrar to schedule.

## Administrative and Office Space

### Standards

Space allocations are commonly managed through standards for office sizes and other common support spaces. Departmental administrative space is regulated through standards as well as policies specific to common issues such as emeritus faculty and multiple offices. The table below shows examples standards from other institutions:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Stanford</b>	<b>UC Berkeley</b>	<b>Michigan</b>
Dean	240	200-240	240
Associate Dean		140-160	160
Assistant Dean		120-150	160
Department Chair		140-160	160
Senior Administrator/Director	140	100-120	100-160
Assistant/Associate Director		100-120	100-140
Tenure Track Faculty	160	120-150	100-160
Non-Tenure Track Faculty		80-150	80-100
Faculty Fellow/Sr. Faculty Fellow		64-95	80
Emeritus Faculty Researcher	160	64-140	64-140
Emeritus Faculty, Teaching	160	64-140	64-140
Emeritus Faculty, Non-active		36-58	30-64
Instructor/Lecturer	80	64-95	80
Adjunct/Visitor (optional)	80	64-95	80
Professional Research Staff		64-100	64-100
Administrative Staff	100	64-95	64-100
Clerical Staff		64-95	64-80
Graduate Students		36-76	30-64
Post Docs/Research Assoc. (theory)	64		

## Multiple Offices for Faculty Members

Multiple offices for faculty members are strongly discouraged; however, in practice schools are inconsistent and exceptions are often recognized for senior leaders or significant research programs in separate facilities.

## Emeritus Faculty

The value of allocating space to emeritus faculty is consistently recognized, but is based on a continued beneficial relationship and subject to an annual review. Most commonly, the individual academic school handles emeritus offices, provided that the emeritus faculty member remains active in teaching or research, and only on a space available basis. Schools with limited space use shared offices.

## Selected Quotes From Policies and Procedures

### SPACE ALLOCATION

“All departments...and centers are expected to resolve modest space needs within their respective schools. Space resulting from any vacancy due to the relocation or discontinuation of activities will be automatically classified as “Provost Reserve” space and will be considered a resource for resolving current and future space needs of the Institute.” – **MIT**

### FACULTY RECRUITING

“It is understood that flexibility in space assignment may be needed during and after the recruiting process for some faculty members. Every effort should be made to ensure that the space assignment adheres to the guidelines.” – **UC Berkeley**

### FINANCIAL MEASURES OF SPACE PRODUCTIVITY

“Schools should develop metrics to assist in the evaluation of research space utilization and periodically determine how the current allocation of research space meet their stated programmatic needs and priorities. Although quantitative measures may not be the final determinant of space allocations, they provide an important step in the evaluation process. The following basic metrics provide a common method of measuring research space usage, regardless of discipline.

- Total externally sponsored research expenditures (direct and indirect costs)(\$/sq. ft.
- Total research expenditures (direct and indirect \$)/sq. ft., regardless of funding source.
- Indirect costs (\$)/sq. ft.

Schools/colleges/units may also identify other types of quantitative or qualitative information to aid in assessments of research space productivity and assignments or to establish internal target goals to support their needs and priorities. Examples include:

- Quality and impact of research being conducted
- Alignment of the research activity with the strategic priorities.
- Number of students participating in the research
- Proportion of the effort dedicated to research (versus instruction or service)
- Proportion of the research activity supported by external awards – **University of Michigan**

#### MULTIPLE OFFICES

“Assignment of multiple offices for faculty and staff is strongly discouraged unless there is a true demonstrated need. Faculty with joint appointments and persons with staff in multiple buildings may be assigned a secondary office, provided it is not located within the same building as the primary office. All decisions related to multiple offices should be made on a case-by-case basis.” – **University of Michigan**

#### EMERITI FACULTY OFFICES

“The campus recognizes the significant value and contributions of emeritus professors...and intends to support...their ongoing scholarly and professional activity. As campus standard, emeritus faculty may occupy a shared office when they are actively engaged in substantial ongoing work that serves the university. Eligible work...is as follows: teaching, research, publication, service. Assignment of a private office to an emeritus professor should be considered an exception to policy and should be based on a level of activity comparable to that of a full-time faculty member.” – **UC Berkeley**

### **Benchmarking Real Estate Management**

Institutions benchmarked (University of Oklahoma, California State Fullerton, Notre Dame, UCLA, University of Pennsylvania, University of Virginia, University of Georgia, William & Mary, Stanford) have set up separate real estate organizations for the following reasons:

#### EXPANSION

Many universities are facing challenges related to the availability of land for expansion. They have developed entities that can act opportunistically to purchase land adjacent to campus.

#### CREATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Two universities created real estate entities specifically to address affordable faculty housing. In both cases, the role of the real estate entity was to purchase land and then develop affordable housing, selling or leasing the houses to faculty.

#### REVENUE

Some universities look to real estate entities outside the endowment as a consistent revenue source. Two regularly return money to the university.



### IMPROVE NEIGHBORHOODS BORDERING THE CAMPUS

One university was facing a crisis at the edges of its campus. The deteriorating neighborhood and crime were impacting campus safety as well as the university's relationship with the city. The university purchased residential real estate and developed commercial real estate at the edge of the campus.

### PROVIDE SPACE FOR RESEARCH COLLABORATIONS, COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, AND RELATED "BAD USE" ACTIVITIES

Several universities have developed research parks to provide opportunities for expanded research and creative collaborations.

### SPEED & AGILITY

At one state institution the state government controls all university real estate. Transactions within this environment move slowly, a characteristic that is detrimental to real estate negotiations. They developed a 501c3 to overcome the state process.

### NEED TO MORE EFFECTIVELY USE REAL ESTATE DONATIONS

Several universities noted that donations of real estate were often insufficiently valued, or ineffectively used by the university. To address this particular challenge, two universities specifically required all future real estate gifts to be processed through the real estate entity.

### **Governance**

Most university real estate entities have a separate board providing the specific expertise required. These boards are deeply integrated with the university's primary board or leadership. For example, one state university 501c3 board includes the President, Provost, Senior Vice President of Development, CFO and outside experts who provide financial and real estate expertise.

### **Structure and Management**

The structures of university real estate entities vary greatly, each exhibiting a unique position in the organization, legal status, size and governance. In one case a 501c3 was critical in creating the arms length relationship. At another, the real estate entity exists within the endowment with a clear focus on non-campus properties. At one university the real estate entity is part of the central administration and falls under the Vice President for Finance and Administration. Connecting the real estate organization to the university leadership is a critical success factor.

## Principles

The committee was charged with developing principles to improve and formalize the process by which space is managed and allocated. The principles proposed are below:

### Ownership and Governance

- The Provost administers all space, owned or leased by the University.
- Day-to-day management is delegated to the Deans and Vice Presidents.
- A University Space Committee should be established to review high level space policies, standards, practices and issues.
- Space assignments are not permanent.
- Space is assigned to activities not individuals, and may be reassigned as activities change.
- Space that is vacant or deemed underutilized is subject to reassignment or repurposing.

### Long-Term Planning

All space decisions should be made within the context of the strategic, financial, and campus master plans, and include a periodic review of the highest and best use of space.

### Priorities

Priority in space allocation will be given to:

- Meeting a strategic need or programmatic goal.
- Collaborative, shared, or multi-use spaces.
- Improving efficiency or productivity.
- Establishing/maintaining an inventory of “swing space” to meet emerging needs.
- Limiting use of rental space.
- Practices that support the Facilities and Administrative rate negotiations with the federal government.

### Transparency

The space allocation process will provide and utilize published:

- Principles, policies, and procedures.
- Space standards for different types of space.
- Metrics of space utilization.

## **Data**

- Comprehensive, accurate current and historical data, including space attributes, occupancy, and utilization information will be maintained.
- Full operating costs and cost recovery will be measured and provided to faculty.

## **Metrics**

Space utilization metrics will be established and considered as factors in space allocation.

## **Space Allocation Review**

Deans and Vice Presidents should review space allocations on a regular basis, with some proportion of the total space reviewed annually. Any appeal of reallocations of space should be to the Dean or Vice President first, and then Provost for final determination.

## **Recommendations**

1. The Provost should adopt and publish the principles outlined above.

## Roles and Responsibilities

The committee was charged with delineating the roles and responsibilities for each party engaged in space management decisions. The responsibilities recommended are listed below:

### Board of Trustees

- Acts through the Buildings and Grounds and Finance Committees of the Board for the stewardship and long-term vision of the campus.
- Approves capital investments exceeding one million dollars and authorizes debt financing.
- Delegates all responsibility for space management to the Administration.

### Provost

- Owns and administers all space.
- Approves space management principles, policies, and standards.
- Annually reviews space allocation on campus.
- Annually reviews and certifies emeritus offices and multiple offices assignments.
- Periodically reviews space allocation to institutes, core research facilities and the Shared Equipment Authority.

### University Space Committee

- The University Space Committee should be established as a standing university committee that advises the Provost.
- Meet three times annually to: review space standards, practices, policies, and case studies; examine long range space planning issues; and review space utilization reports.

### Vice Provost for Research

- Jointly manages space allocated to centers, institutes, Shared Equipment Authority, vivarium and other centrally managed research operations.

### Deans & Vice Presidents

- Provides day-to-day management of assigned space.
- Annually reviews space allocations.
- Jointly manages space allocated to centers, institutes, and the Shared Equipment Authority in collaboration with the Vice Provost of Research.
- Prepares, maintains and shares with the Provost, space-planning reports.

## **Department Chairs**

- Provides day-to-day management of department/unit space as delegated by the Dean.

## **Vice President for Administration**

- Chairs the University Space Committee.
- Administers the annual capital budget process.
- Oversees the Facilities Engineering and Planning Department.

## **Vice President for Finance**

- Reviews and confirms funding for: annual capital budget process; funding for new faculty offers; facility capital investments; equipment purchases.
- Develops financing and debt plans for capital projects, in collaboration with the Vice President for Investments and the General Counsel.
- Develops and negotiates F&A rate.

## **Vice President for Investments and Treasurer**

- Coordinates and manages real estate investments.
- Coordinates debt-financing plans.

## **Registrar**

- Management and scheduling of all instructional classroom spaces.

## **Facilities Engineering & Planning**

- Custodian of the Campus Master Plan.
- Operation, maintenance, and planning of University physical assets including land.
- Maintains design guidelines and space standards.
- Maintains space database, including facility condition and use.
- Executes process of new construction and renovations.
- Manages annual capital budget process.
- Staffs the space planning and allocation process.

## **Recommendations**

1. The Provost should adopt and publish the roles and responsibilities delineated above.
2. The Space Task Force should convert to the University Space Committee and meet three times annually. The Vice President for Administration should chair the committee.

# The Planning Process

## Master Planning

In 1910 the firm Goodhue, Cram and Ferguson created the first campus master plan. The last plan, published in 2004 and updated in 2009 by Michael Graves, incorporated a south axis strategy that connects the campus to the Texas Medical Center, and provides for a doubling of the built space on campus. Rice has hired a new master-planning firm to develop an Integrated Resource and Land-Use Plan focusing on infrastructure, storm water, landscape, and parking.

## Precinct Plans

Precinct plans are developed as needed to guide individual projects within a zone of the campus. Precinct plans are smaller scale master plans that focus on defining green space, building capacities, resource conflicts and access issues. Precinct plans have been used effectively in the early planning of the residential colleges, the development of the engineering and central quadrangles, and to determine resource constraints for the new south axis.

## Major Capital Investment Plan

The capital investment plan is overseen by the Vice President of Finance and includes a list of facilities recently built or soon to be built, and the funding plan for each facility.

## Deferred Maintenance

Each year, 20% of the campus facilities are assessed using industry standards and methodology. This assessment and related analysis helps the university to determine where to invest in building upgrades and infrastructure.

## Micro Planning

The policies and guidelines in this report are examples of micro planning tools. For example, the capital budgeting process is the annual review and prioritization of the collective capital needs of the university. Faculty hiring plans constitute another example. Each of these micro planning processes and tools are enhanced when used in the context of broader planning goals.

## Recommendations

1. The Integrated Resource and Land-Use Planning process should incorporate components and principles from this task force report. The result should be a comprehensive plan for relocating, renovating and decommissioning space that is aligned with broader university goals, strategies and financial resources over a five-year timeframe.

## Research Space

Research space is almost always the most expensive space to construct, renovate and operate. The process of reallocation and renovation of research space needs improvement and the task force was charged with making recommendations. The following principles and processes should be used to inform decisions regarding the allocation and renovation of research space.

### Principles

- Research space is owned and administered by the Provost.
- The Provost delegates research space management for schools to the respective Deans.
- Changes in space allocation of centrally reporting research activities (such as institutes) must be approved by the Provost given recommendations from the relevant Dean(s), Vice Provost for Research, and the Vice Presidents for Finance and Administration.
- Deans may delegate decision-making authority to Department Chairs or Directors.
- Space is assigned to activities and not individuals, and is not permanent.
- Objective measures of space utilization should be employed to conduct an annual review.
- Space that is deemed underutilized through a review process is subject to reassignment.
- Modular research space should be constructed whenever possible to standardize space assignments and optimize investments.

### Common Data Collection

The following common data should be collected for all research space, regardless of discipline:

- Researcher and Academic Department/School.
- General description of research.
- Total assignable square feet of research space.
- Quality of space (NSF Guidelines).
- Type of research space (wet, dry, non-computational, computational).
- Good use/bad use designation (Internal Revenue Service requirement).
- Total research expenditures (\$) for on-campus activities from all sources.
- Annual M&O costs (\$).
- Annual indirect cost recovery (\$).
- Number of full-time people participating in the research (by classification: graduate student, post doc, research staff).
- Instructional use.

## Common Basis for Measurements of Utilization

The following metrics have been established to provide a common basis for measurement of utilization of all research space, regardless of discipline:

- Total research expenditures (\$)/assignable square feet (3-year average).
- Actual indirect cost recovery (\$)/assignable square feet (3-year average).
- Assignable square feet/person participating in full-time research (3-year average).

## Additional Factors to Consider in the Review and Allocation of Space

Measures for research may vary based on criteria deemed important or valued by each school or department. Schools and departments may identify other factors or information to inform the assessment of research space productivity. Examples include:

- Alignment with school or university strategic priorities.
- Quality and impact of research being conducted.
- Proportion of the effort devoted to instruction or service.

## Annual Review

One task was to find models that employed a system of implied rent to create a marketplace for space. No successful models were found. Those that had used this approach were ending this policy, finding limited benefits and unintended consequences such as wealthy schools or departments buying space and instances of gaming the marketplace to reallocate poorly located or lower quality space. The task force recommends another approach that achieves the same outcome by employing a 1-n ranking of utilization based on a common set of metrics. At the end of each fiscal year the Provost's Office should post a campus-wide ranking for each of the three metrics above for faculty who have been assigned research space. A school ranking will also be produced and the Deans will review the bottom quartile of each metric (3-year average) for potential reallocation of space.

## New Hire Space Allocation

### Standards

New assistant professors that conduct experimental laboratory research will be allocated 800 – 1,200 assignable square feet. The Provost must approve exceptions to this policy.

### Process

The current process for allocating space for new hires has flaws that need to be addressed: communication about expectations, requirements and scope, and constraints; timeliness; and costs. The task force recommends a clearer definition of recommended roles, shown below:



	Provost	Dean	Dept. Chair	FE&P	VP Finance
<b>Pre-Search Requirements</b>					
Type of Hire/Research (experimentalist, theoretician, etc.)		✓	✓		
Specific Location Options		✓	✓	✓	
Expected Attributes Required of Space		✓	✓	✓	
Proposed Budget for Renovation		✓	✓	✓	✓
Preparation and submission of Recruitment Proposal		✓	✓		
Approval of Recruitment Proposal	✓				✓
<b>Conduct Search</b>					
Create "Short List" of Candidates		✓	✓		
Validating space requirements against Recruitment Proposal		✓	✓	✓	
Request Critical Research Lab Attributes from Interviewees			✓		
Meeting during Campus Visit to Discuss Lab Requirements			✓	✓	
Project Scope and Budget Definition		✓	✓	✓	
Project Scope and Budget Approval	✓	✓			✓
<b>Negotiation Phase</b>					
Extend Offer	✓	✓	✓		✓
Negotiate And Approve of Package	✓	✓	✓		✓
<b>Project Delivery</b>					
Programming and Project Definition			✓	✓	
Project Scope and Budget Approval	✓	✓			✓
Design and Construction			✓	✓	

## Process for Renovation of Space

The current process for renovating space has a number of weaknesses that need to be addressed: communication about expectations, requirements and scope, and constraints; lack of modular space; timeliness; and costs. An external review of the process (to include all of the steps shown on the previous chart) is needed. The review should include a number of 'case studies' of recent projects.

## Recommendations

1. The Provost should adopt and publish the principles and processes delineated above.
2. At the end of each fiscal year the Provost's Office will create and post a campus-wide ranking for each of the three metrics below for faculty who have been assigned research space. A School ranking will also be produced and the Deans will review the bottom quartile of each metric (3-year average) for potential reallocation of space.
  - a. Total research expenditures (\$)/assignable square feet.
  - b. Actual indirect cost recovery (\$)/assignable square feet.
  - c. Assignable square feet/person participating full time in the research.
3. New assistant professors that conduct experimental research will be allocated 800 – 1,200 assignable square feet. The Provost must approve exceptions to this policy.
4. An external review of the entire faculty start-up and renovations process should be conducted.

## Instructional Spaces

All instructional space falls under the authority of the Provost, who has delegated full responsibility for management to the Registrar.

The task force reviewed the recommendations of the 2010 Classroom Task Force chaired by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The recommendations below are consistent with those made by the prior task force.

### Standard Time Blocks

A course with an irregular meeting pattern overlaps many other courses, which reduces the number of options for students and makes it difficult to efficiently assign classrooms. Thus departments must assign courses to Standard Time Blocks, as defined by the Registrar in the Schedule Rules and Definitions. This applies to courses taught Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Provost must approve exceptions.

### Anchor Courses

A best practice for space allocation first assigns space for very large courses, followed by assignment for all other courses. Most of the largest courses Rice offers are service courses in CHEM, MATH, PHYS, BIOS, and STAT. These courses should be anchored with unchanged day/time meeting patterns from year to year. Fixing the schedules of these anchor courses provides a stable base around which all other Rice courses and classroom assignments can be built.

### Courses Offered During Prime Time

No more than 2/3 of a department's course offerings may be scheduled during prime time to prevent exhausting the classroom supply during these periods. Prime Time is defined as 10:00 to 11:50 a.m. and 1:00 to 1:50 p.m. on Mon/Wed/Fri; and 9:25 a.m. to 12:05 p.m. and 1:00 to 2:15 p.m. on Tue/Thu.

### Departmentally Scheduled Rooms That Could Be Used For Instruction

Rooms used for teaching fall into two categories – those that are Registrar scheduled for classes and those that are departmentally scheduled for classes, meetings, events, or other group uses. All departmentally scheduled lecture halls, or other rooms that could be used for instruction, should be made available to the Registrar to schedule for use in the mornings (up until 12:00pm). The standard scheduling practice would be to give priority to the department's own classes in rooms adjacent to their department. The Classroom Committee would assume responsibility for maintaining the technology in Registrar scheduled instructional spaces.

## Increase Utilization

The Registrar should regularly assess opportunities to increase utilization of instructional spaces, including teaching laboratories. To inform stakeholders about the opportunities to increase utilization of instructional spaces the Registrar should produce an annual utilization report. The report should specifically address classrooms with the lowest weekly hours scheduled and attempt to determine the causes.

## Classroom Maintenance and Renovation

A set of generally standard hardware and software technologies are present in over 100 Registrar-controlled classrooms. Managing the technology and physical lifecycle, maintenance, and support in the Registrar-scheduled spaces is overseen by a classroom committee with membership from the Registrar, Vice Provost for Information Technology, and Facilities, Engineering and Planning. Funds for upgrading classrooms are provided through the annual capital budget and the committee sets priorities and oversees implementation. The committee should continue and be expanded to include faculty.

Rice should plan for a few classrooms to be unused each semester. This enables maintenance and renovation work to occur throughout the year instead of only during the summer.

## Recommendations

1. All courses should be fit into standard time blocks as defined by the Registrar. The Provost must approve exceptions.
2. No more than 2/3 of a department's course offerings may be scheduled during prime time as defined by the Registrar.
3. All departmentally scheduled lecture halls or other rooms that could be used for instruction should be made available to the Registrar to schedule for use in the mornings (up until 12:00pm).
4. The Classroom Committee should be expanded to include faculty.

# Office and Administrative Space

All office and administrative space falls under the authority of the Provost, who has delegated management to Deans, Vice Presidents, and Vice Provosts. The following recommendations are intended to inform decisions about the allocation of offices and administrative space.

## Administrative Space Guidelines

Administrative Space Guidelines are intended to assure that Rice uses office space efficiently and effectively to: evaluate space requests; project future space requirements; and, ensure each campus unit is adequately and equitably housed. The table below shows the task force’s recommended assignable square feet per person by position type.

	Square Feet
Provost	280-300
Vice Provost	225-250
Dean	250-275
Department Chair	175-200
Tenure-Track Faculty	150-165
Non Tenure-Track Faculty	100-120
Post Doc	70-95
Research Assistant	35-50
Graduate Student	35-50
Vice President	250-275
Assistant/Associate Vice President	150-175
Director/Manager	100-120
Professional/Technical	80-100
Staff Workstation	60-100

## Special Circumstances

### OLDER BUILDINGS

In circumstances where existing conditions are non-conforming it is recognized that common sense, financial and architectural feasibility should apply.

### FACULTY RECRUITING AND RETENTION

While every effort should be made to follow the guidelines, the programmatic instructional and research needs of the university may take precedence. The Provost should approve exceptions to the space guidelines on a case-by-case basis.

### MULTIPLE OFFICES

Multiple offices for faculty or staff are not allowed. The Provost may approve assignment of a secondary office on an exception and time-limited basis. The Provost should review all multiple office assignments each year.

### EMERITUS FACULTY OFFICES

Rice recognizes and values the contributions of emeritus faculty and supports their ongoing scholarly and professional activity. On a space available basis, emeritus faculty may occupy shared office space when they are actively engaged in ongoing teaching, research, publication, or service to the University. Assignment of a private office to an emeritus professor must be approved by the Provost as an exception to policy and should be based on a level of activity comparable to that of a full-time faculty member. Deans must certify annually to the Provost that the assignment of offices to emeritus faculty in their school will meet the criteria above. The Provost should review all faculty emeritus office assignments each year.

## Current Conditions

It is currently difficult to find one vacant office on the campus that is available for reassignment, thus hampering the mission of the university. In addition, some key off-campus leases will end over the next five years. A comprehensive review of office and administrative space is needed to ensure effective allocation and to plan for future needs.

## Recommendations

1. The Provost should adopt and publish the standards and principles outlined above.
2. The Vice President for Administration should undertake a campus-wide study of office and administrative space using the standards and principles in this report. The goal is to free up space to accommodate growth and emerging priorities in the short term, and to develop a long-term plan. The study should be completed within one year.

## Outdoor Spaces

Campus outdoor space is also a critical university resource and is a component of Rice's recognition by the Princeton Review as having the number 1 ranking for Best Quality of Life. Changes to the use of exterior space can impact the learning and working experience and can possibly impact sustainability, storm water management, liability, and traffic.

It is not unusual for various campus constituents to request use of exterior campus spaces for a permanent or semi-permanent need. These requests include the use of outdoor space for research or research equipment, the development of seating or plaza areas for a specific department or function, the use of parking or paved areas for storage of vehicles/trailers/watercraft, and the enhancement of a location for social activities including patios or seating.

The management of all campus outdoor space is delegated to the Vice President for Administration. Facilities, Engineering and Planning facilitates the process of requests for semi-permanent or permanent changes of use of exterior campus space. Requests should be made through the appropriate Dean or Vice President overseeing the department or school from which the request originates. When the request is specifically related to an academic/research activity, the request must also be submitted to the Provost.

### Recommendations

1. The Vice President for Administration should adopt and publish the process and practices outlined above.

## Real Estate Considerations

Rice has not addressed the strategic use of property, adjacent or close to the campus. Investments in real estate have been made and managed through the university's endowment. However, an inherent conflict exists between the core mission of the endowment to maximize returns and other mission-centered real estate strategies that may be of importance to Rice.

### Real Estate Challenges at Rice University

#### PROPERTIES SITTING FALLOW AND NOT PRODUCING RETURNS FOR RICE

Several attempts have been made to consider alternative development strategies for the property adjacent to Greenbriar. No attempt has yet been made to plan or develop the property at Travis and University. These properties, held by the endowment, incur costs with no offsetting revenue.

#### NOT HAVING A STRATEGY OR BEING NIMBLE ENOUGH TO REACT TO MARKET OPPORTUNITIES

Over the past two years, several properties within three miles of the campus (e.g., Shell campus, Exxon campus, property in Rice Village) became available but Rice did not have a process and capability to determine how or if these properties should be pursued.

#### TAKING A ONE HUNDRED YEAR VIEW OF THE CAMPUS AND ADJACENT LAND

While careful planning will allow Rice to meet its needs, primarily on campus, for the next few decades, the university will be faced with the need to expand elsewhere over the longer term.

#### CHANGING ACADEMIC ASPIRATIONS AND PLANS

Rice's academic strategy is now reaching deeply into the Texas Medical Center, the Museum District, and into the Houston corporate environment. This activity is limited in some on-campus Rice buildings by "bad use" designations for various legal and tax reasons.

#### FUNCTIONS THAT WOULD BE BETTER PLACED OFF-CAMPUS

Rice has, at various times, considered creating off-campus housing, parking, retail, and a hotel and conference center. However, Rice does not have an institutional capability to develop a real estate strategy, quickly analyze opportunities as they arise, and execute a transaction.

## Recommendations

1. FE&P and the Vice President for Investments should conduct a workshop to determine the mission and goals of a real estate strategy and then recommend the organization, management, and governance structures to support that mission and those goals.



## Immediate Next Steps

The task force recommends the following next steps for implementing this report:

- The task force report represents a significant change in the way space is managed at Rice. The report should be widely circulated for comment, both to improve the document and to inform the campus community of the proposed changes. The draft report should be presented to the Dean's Council, the Faculty Senate and the Administrators' Forum.
- The Provost should assign responsibility for implementation of each recommendation to specific individuals with an appropriate timeline.
- The University Space Committee should be formally established.
- The senior space planning position within Facilities Engineering & Planning should be expanded from 0.5 FTE to full time.
- A 'space' website should be created which delineates the space standards, processes, and practices of the university.
- The Integrated Resource and Land-Use Planning process should incorporate components and principles from this study.
- The Vice President for Administration should undertake a campus-wide study of office and administrative space using the standards and principles in this report. The goal is to free up space to accommodate growth and emerging priorities in the short term, and to develop a long-term plan.
- Conduct a workshop to consider the development of a university real estate entity.

## Appendix A

### Task Force Members

Barbara Bryson	Associate Vice President, Facilities, Engineering & Planning
Kathy Collins	Vice President, Finance
Vicki Colvin	Vice Provost, Research
Pat Dwyer	Senior Project Manager, Facilities, Engineering & Planning
Carlos Garcia	Director of Research Development & Infrastructure , Office of Research
Kevin Kirby	Vice President, Administration
Lyn Ragsdale	Dean, School of Social Sciences
Bart Sinclair	Associate Dean, Brown School of Engineering
Jim Smolen	Senior Cost & Rate Analyst, Research & Cost Accounting
Ned Thomas	Dean, Brown School of Engineering
Kenton Whitmire	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Wiess School of Natural Sciences