

**2C. Enhance infrastructure for research and creative activities: Space planning:** Central help to units to identify suitable office and laboratory space is necessary. Planning for future expansion is essential. Committee: Bob Martin, Jeff Watt, Karen Whitney, Emily Wren.

**Current status:**

- A good status report exists from 2004. It provides an assessment of the research space needs at IUPUI. This report was prepared by a Research Space Task Force established by the Vice President for Research and the University Architect.
- For IUPUI, there is an immediate need for an additional 700,000 assignable sq. ft., a very grave situation and a significant impediment to reaching full potential as a research university. Research and creative space, whether it be for wet laboratories, animal care facilities, art and music studios, or simply faculty office space is in short supply.
- The support received from the State and Legislature for the construction of new buildings over many years is appreciated. Law, Art, Informatics and Medicine have major new buildings. Yet, they have not completely obviated even that discipline's current need, and there is a major space crisis looming. Other disciplines, which have not had new buildings recently, are clearly in much worse shape. The need for more space stems not from any weakness at IUPUI, but instead from its success and determined effort in becoming a more research-oriented campus.
- The lack of space is hurting the campus in terms of prestige, research dollars, potential faculty and program additions, and in terms of vision and planning, as many units simply keep their ideas quiet, knowing there is little hope for a place to realize them - a very dangerous condition in a highly competitive climate among research universities.

**Recommendations/suggestions:**

- The University and the State should join with the faculty and the deans in making research space a top priority in the coming years. The State and the business community need to be fully informed about the acuteness of the space problem and how it negatively affects attempts to build a meaningful "knowledge-based" economy in Indiana. Research space must be viewed as an investment in the future. Several other states have attacked the problem aggressively via multi-billion dollar academic space bonds for use by their public universities.
- IUPUI could consider self-funding some research space, perhaps for constructing flexible buildings using grant income, gift money or State funds. One possibility is to construct "shells" of buildings and expect occupants to build out the interiors.
- IUPUI must work to surmount barriers and create the bonding authority needed to self-fund construction and renovation of space, without waiting for State biennial processes. This should be possible given that IU's and the State's bond ratings are among the nation's best, and our existing bonding debt will decline significantly in the near future as old issues are paid off.
- Space needs should be given a much higher priority in future fundraising campaigns, which have often focused primarily on faculty chairs and student fellowships.
- Continuing work on a Master Space Plan is essential.

**Implementation:**

- Space issues should be stressed by the new IU administration.

# **Indiana University's Need for Research Space: A Report to the Vice President for Research and University Architect from the Joint Research Space Task Forces at IUB and IUPUI**

---



## **1. Summary**

This report provides a broad assessment of the research space needs on the IU Bloomington (IUB) and Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) campuses at Indiana University (IU) where over 95% of the University's research is done. This report was prepared by the Joint Research Space Task Forces which were established for this purpose by the Vice President for Research and the University Architect. The Task Forces had faculty members from all schools at IUB and IUPUI, members from the faculty councils and members from campus and University offices. Support to them was provided by the Offices of the Vice President for Research and the University Architect. This report is based on data provided by the offices of the deans of all the schools at IUB and IUPUI (see attached spreadsheets); the data were subsequently analyzed and aggregated by the Task Forces and the Architect's Office. Though there are some differences between both campuses concerning perception of the research space problem, the similarities overwhelmed these and it was decided to issue a single report.

***In summary then, the Task Forces have determined that at IUB there is an immediate need for 984,676 assignable sq. ft. of space and an additional need for another 173,850 assignable sq. ft. within 10 years, while at IUPUI there is an immediate need for 692,515 assignable sq. ft. with an additional need for another 1.27 million assignable sq. ft. within 10 years. In aggregate, Indiana University has an immediate need for 1,677,191 assignable sq. ft. of space and 1.44 million assignable sq. ft. within 10 years – a total need of over 3 million sq. ft. At an efficiency percentage of 60%, this translates into a need for a total of about 5 million gross sq. ft. It should be stressed that this is only a rough “first approximation” to the true scope and scale of the problem and as such is neither fully comprehensive nor detailed. However we firmly believe that further approximations will only add to the scale of this problem, not reduce it.***

We believe that this represents a very grave situation and represents possibly the biggest single impediment to IU reaching its full potential as a research university. We are very strongly of the opinion that the President and Trustees at Indiana University must take urgent action to begin to put a plan in place to address this problem over the next 10 to 20 years. Without such a plan, IU will begin to slip behind other comparable research universities as it simply will not have the space to sustain increases in research activities. More specifically, lack of research space stands to seriously jeopardize President Herbert's goal, as announced in his inauguration address, to double external research funding.

## 2. Overview

Research and creative space, whether it be for wet laboratories, animal care facilities, “hardened” machine rooms, art and music studios, focus group study areas, or simply faculty office space in which reading, writing and thinking take place, is in drastically short supply across virtually all disciplines on both the IUB and IUPUI campuses.

We found that with very few exceptions, school deans believe that the key limiting factor on advancing their school’s research missions is space. Many have restricted or altered the course of their school’s progress to fit their current, inadequate space; others have neglected to hire new faculty due not to a lack of salary or research funds, but to lack of space; in some cases, faculty we have sought to recruit have declined to come to Indiana because of space limitations; and still other disciplines have encountered acute shortages of space even after acquiring a new building, their needs having outgrown these buildings during the planning stage.

We found that shortage of quality space seems to have no relationship to school quality or national prestige. This does not mean that schools have found ways to be excellent and therefore really don’t need space. It means that schools have been successful in spite of their shortcomings, and that schools have done remarkably well with what space they have. In many cases new or renovated buildings have led to what the departments occupying them predicted: a flowering of the research in the discipline, and concomitant benefit for students, the community and the State. In some cases, we are finding that those schools – Music at IUB being a good example – which are in desperate need of renovation and expansion have just about reached the end of what they can do well without new and/or renovated space. It is unfortunate at best that these true areas of national and world excellence are being compromised due to this problem – areas that represent potential solutions to economic development and the “brain drain” – but that is the present and growing reality.

We fully acknowledge the outstanding support for the construction of new buildings that Indiana University has consistently received from the State and Legislature over many years. That this support has continued unabated through the recent very difficult economic times for the State is particularly remarkable and demonstrates vision and far-sightedness. State funding has been critical to constructing new facilities for the School of Medicine, the renovation of Myers Hall at IUB, and other recent projects such as MPRI at the IU Cyclotron Facility. These projects have shown what great successes can occur when targeted investments are made. This is an era of increasing expense in terms of the type and quantity of scientific and technical equipment needs, and when those have been met, great things have occurred. Throughout our campuses, many new buildings have been constructed in the past two decades and several others have been renovated. From one perspective, it would seem that a lot of great things have happened.

But what must be considered in 2004 is that as one University, we have seven campuses that can be characterized as growing and an eighth, IUB, while correctly described by the Indiana Commission on Higher Education as “mature,” is nonetheless growing in breadth

and depth of research quality. For example, in FY2003/04, externally funded research carried out at IUB grew by around an amazing 30% for a total of over \$120 million. Consequently there is a continuing growing need for space at IU that has consistently out-paced the long-standing capital priorities system at the University, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and the State budget process. This has created a “waiting list” on which a discipline or school can sit for more than twenty years. (Given this, it is easy to understand how a discipline can outgrow its needs for space during the planning and construction phases, given their length.) We also found that enrollment growth, the changing nature of research in some disciplines, and the expectation, both internally and externally, that Indiana University contribute significantly to the development of a knowledge-based economy, have all increased IU’s need for space, or renovation of the space IU does have.

There is no one solution to the problem. In this document and the accompanying spreadsheets, we have been able to demonstrate the nature of the need and suggest a few paths to solutions to the space crisis. We urge the University and the State to join with the faculty and the deans in making research space a top priority in the coming years.

Indiana University classifies space by usage in a way that makes calculation of present “research space” somewhat complex. In our survey, we have included as research space any laboratory, office or common room that is required for the conduct of research. In some disciplines, that could mean wet labs, machine rooms, ordinary offices, computer-assisted rooms for the completion of group projects, art studios, even musical practice space. In some cases, these uses are shared with instructional space – there are disciplines, such as Music, in which the faculty office also serves as composition/rehearsal studio and as tutorial room for instruction. (Throughout this document, when we use the term “research space” we include space for creative and artistic activity of the appropriate faculty as well.) In the current version of the IU Fact Book, IUB academic-administrative space is listed at nearly 5 million assignable square feet (asf), while IUPUI has nearly 3 million asf. Of that, IUB’s non-class laboratories and offices total about 2 million asf, while IUPUI’s total about 1.5 million asf. Much of the physical plant, especially at IUB, is in critical need of renovation – a need which is well known to the Architect’s Office and the Capital Priorities Committee, and which is reflected in the spreadsheets that make up part of this report. That need grows more critical each year, especially as the State, albeit temporarily, ceased to fund repairs and renovation (R&R) in any substantial way in the 1990’s.

### **3. The Need**

Expressed in square footage, IUB shows the most urgent present need, at 984,676 square feet, with a more modest additional 173,850 asf required within ten years. IUPUI has a present need of 692,515 asf with an additional 1.27 million asf needed within the next ten years. Among the Big Ten, IUB is last in terms of space per FTE, while IUPUI, if added to the Big Ten, would be only slightly above IUB. In terms of non-class lab space, a closer measure of research space, IUB is last of a group that includes the Big Ten, IUPUI and Illinois-Chicago. In that figure, the group average is in the mid-30’s, in terms of

assignable square feet/FTE, while IUB has only 13.22 sq.ft/FTE, and IUPUI 20.62. The State has estimated the need for research space more conservatively, but their estimate still shows that for IU's present programs, without regard to the quality of the space and in terms of gross square footage, the University is 350,000 sq. ft. short of meeting this need.

Part of the reason for the slightly better IUPUI situation reflects the R&R funding situation described above, and part is due to IUPUI's recent spate of new construction. In very recent years, Law, Art, Informatics and Medicine have constructed major new buildings, thus lessening the present need. But in each case, the new building has not completely obviated even that discipline's current need, while all four of those disciplines clearly see a major space crisis looming just a few years from now. Other disciplines, which have not had new buildings recently, are clearly in much worse shape.

It is beyond the charge to the Research Space Task Force to consider non-research issues, but we note that affecting the ability to meet the need of space for researchers are many other considerations and needs, not least of which is a critical shortage of classroom space at both campuses and, the mandate to replace the IU Power Plant at IUB within the next four years, at a cost estimated at more than \$150 million. While some viewed the power plant as a competing need to research space, we believe it is vital to allow for the continuation of research. This is a case easier to make within IUB than outside of it, as faculty are aware on campus that no more new space can come on line without an expansion of power, heating and cooling capacity; indeed, in summer "cycling," i.e., not fully cooling, most of the campus, due to the limited capacity, is already taking place. In addition there is a need for renovations at IUB with a total cost of \$333,978,000 which at IUPUI the cost of these is \$129,697,000. (More details can be found in the attached spreadsheets).

In what follows, we sketch some of the research space needs and related issues at IUB and IUPUI that fill out in more detail the grave nature of these problems.

### **3.1 IUB**

Categorized by the State as a "mature" campus, and carrying a commitment to maintain and renovate its historic buildings, renowned nationally for its beauty, IUB suffers not only from an absolute need for space but also from the poor condition of many buildings. Across the campus, several disciplines have turned away from national directions they could easily pursue, owing to the lack of space. Journalism, wedged into a small, old building that cannot easily be expanded, finds itself unable to pursue as much broadcast and online work as it should and could; SPEA, which has been crunched for space since the early 1980's, has new faculty arriving who work in environmental science but lack any laboratory space at all; and Music, the widely acknowledged crown jewel of IU, has research space so old that it lacks heat and humidity control, despite the virtually priceless nature of the instruments the facility must house. Like other schools at IU, Music has developed a national reputation not only for excellence, but also for poor quality space. Faculty who come to the School from other institutions do so in spite of

their reservations about the quality and quantity of space. However, some we would like to recruit have not come to Indiana due to the space issues.

The largest school on campus by far is the College of Arts and Sciences, with a breadth of disciplines unmatched by any other in the University. Its needs are critical in a number of areas, including fine arts, theater, general humanities, geology, physics, sociology, chemistry, and many others. Even less well known departments such as apparel merchandising have priceless collections, such as the Sage Costume collection, or the Central Eurasian Studies' Tibetan Art Collection, that either cannot be displayed or cannot be properly, or even adequately, conserved in their current space.

The College occupies the campus's largest building, Ballantine Hall. Built in the 1950's, it has three floors of classrooms that cannot be put off line for a badly needed renovation, and six floors of faculty offices, mostly in the humanities, above these. Not a particularly admired building, it can neither be renovated nor replaced until a plan to handle its occupants during that process can be devised. While it continues to be functional and many of its classrooms have been upgraded, others have not and desperately need modern technology as well as up to date heating and cooling systems.

The fastest growing school on both campuses is Informatics; in Bloomington, the shrewd renovation of an old sorority house gave the school a place to begin. New hires – world-renowned researchers in this exciting new field -- are coming to IUB from all over the world but many have significant space needs. One has arrived from Paris with a need to house eight research associates. To inhibit this kind of faculty member, and this kind of exciting discipline, owing to space problems, is a shortsighted and mistaken thing to do; yet there may be no alternative given our current resource problems.

At IUB what was often referred to as the “new library” (1971) became the old library, deeply in need of extensive renovation and of modernization for a multimedia age. Some funds were scraped together to create the innovative Information Commons for research in the lower floors of the Library, but it still needs massive work throughout, as well as expansion. This facility, one of the top 15 libraries in the country, is one of the gems of Indiana yet needs a virtually complete overhaul. Down the street, the Lilly Library, IU's world-renowned rare book library, which is a great faculty recruitment tool as well as a magnet for scholars worldwide, is in equally dire need of renovation and expansion. Both are key research facilities, especially in the humanities and social sciences.

### **3.2 IUPUI**

In Indianapolis, despite recent construction, the School of Medicine is out of research space, with new faculty arriving each year, invitations to apply for major grants increasing rapidly, and partnerships with Lilly, Guidant and others booming due to various life science initiatives within the State. The School of Nursing is unable to respond to the national boom in nursing demand because it has no more office space, let alone laboratory space, even at a time when faculty who retire are leaving teaching-only positions and being replaced with more research-incentive faculty. Similarly, the School

of Liberal Arts has a number of teaching faculty who are retiring and being replaced with researchers, again for whom there is no provision for space. Cavanaugh Hall is probably the IUPUI “poster child” for poor quality space. By dividing already small offices into tiny cubicles, the School of Liberal Arts has been able to house, in some fashion, most of its faculty and staff, but the space available to these key scholars and teachers is so poor and so small that to conduct any research there is extremely difficult.

Around the campus, there is simply no space that can be used by anyone. The only option left, beyond building new space or acquiring newly renovated space, is to rent space off campus. Because of its downtown location, and, ironically, because of its own success as a thriving and growing urban campus, IUPUI faces a rental market with low availability and steep rent, thus making the problem even worse.

At any campus, research faculty tend to bring with them other positions such as students, postdocs and staff, who are vital to their continuing research and who contribute to the continued flow of funds to the University, especially in an era of very large multi-investigator grants. In the health sciences disciplines, at IUPUI in particular, but also extending into other fields, the lack of space for these work groups has constrained or even prevented many possible new directions in research.

#### **4. The Good News**

Certainly with a critical need, in essence, to double IU’s existing research space, it might be hard to find good news. But the reason so much space is needed is that IU is so remarkably strong in so many areas. There is no better evidence for this than IU’s continued remarkable ability to attract external research funding – funding which totaled over \$400 million in 2003/2004. But it is this very ability to attract external funding that is so much in jeopardy if the amount of research space at IU is not dramatically increased soon.

At IUB, the past twenty years have shown a broadening of excellence in areas that have not always been considered the strongest. The School of HPER, for example, is now the second largest academic unit on campus in terms of credit hours taught and has large and significant relationships with the National Park Service and other external entities, along with plans for a center on “living well” which no doubt will result in more external support, an important impact on the State, and a need for much more space. In the School of Education, several centers and institutes are internationally renowned and generate significant prestige, but are spread throughout campus and even the city in the constant quest for space.

At IUPUI, the trend over the last several years toward a more research-oriented campus outside the School of Medicine, coupled by the effective presence of a strong, research-minded dean within the School of Medicine, has set the stage for a current and future need which far outstrips anything that was envisioned for IUPUI at its inception. Thus, the need at IUPUI grows from strength, not weakness.

Another piece of good news is that recently renovated and constructed new buildings at IUPUI have met a significant portion of the present need for research, though not all disciplines are by any means on a sound footing in terms of space, and some, as indicated above, are in very poor shape.

## **5. Research Space vs. Other Space**

We found in our survey that while space takes on many configurations and the needs for different types vary greatly by discipline, to a certain extent, schools simply needed renovation of their current space to meet new technologies and new requirements, either self-imposed to maintain disciplinary competitiveness or externally mandated. Faculty repeatedly expressed the idea that office, classroom and laboratory (or other research space) need to be co-located for best use of faculty time and resources. Even “auxiliary” space such as the Student Recreational Sports Center and the Wildermuth portion of the HPER building are closely linked to the academic mission, and therefore to the work of much of the faculty. Though this report does not speak directly to non-research space, we encourage the University to continue to think of space as a unified concept and to work with schools and disciplines to solve all their space needs in concert, not separately. Faculty also repeatedly indicated the importance of ensuring that students and faculty must be taking classes, working together, and conducting research at the same or contiguous locations, in order for the academic mission to be successfully met.

## **6. Differences in Perception between Campuses**

These are generalizations which, we believe, hold true at the “30,000 foot” level. While IUPUI’s need for space seems more acute at present, in the sense that there is simply no available vacant space of any kind within the 513-acre boundary, the expectations of solutions there were much more positive. Perhaps because of its impressive growth in the past 20 years, many schools on the campus expect to have their needs met, and are therefore more at ease at expressing them. Thus, for example, the School of Medicine was able to describe 850,000 asf of needed space, even though the School has just constructed three new facilities.

At IUB, a tiny amount of poor-quality space shared with a student residential facility was still available as we began to create this report; by now, however, even that undesirable space has been claimed, and the campus is once again completely out of space. It is expected that some of the campus’s most marginal space, which was built in the 1940’s and 1950’s, and which is now being used as “swing” space for departments that are displaced by construction or renovation, will be demolished. But at the same time, on both campuses there is a lack of such “swing” space, which history bears out is a permanent, ongoing need. There will always be someone who is displaced from his regular space and who needs to utilize “swing” space, though neither campus has ever formally created such space.

IUB deans and faculty have operated, in terms of space, in what we might term a culture of poverty or deprivation. It took several conversations and emails in some cases to arrive

at most schools' true expressions of need; some disciplines have effectively long ago given up on the idea of quality, contiguous space for research, and have tailored their departments and research interests accordingly. Some, like the School of Music and the Department of Theater and Drama, seem to have put forward their acute needs for renovations for so long that they scarcely believe there will ever be a satisfactory resolution.

So, beautified by its crescent of historic buildings, IUB is also saddled with a great deal of rundown, poor quality academic space, and with a belief that all one can do is wait in a capital priorities line that can stretch out for more than twenty years. This condition has not only cost the campus in terms of prestige, research dollars, and potential faculty and program additions; it has also cost it in terms of vision and planning, as many units simply keep their ideas quiet, knowing there is little hope for a place to realize them. In some IUPUI schools, we saw the same phenomenon at work, a very dangerous condition in a highly competitive climate among research universities.

## **7. Possible Solutions**

The first and most significant possible answer is to fully inform the State, the business community and the University at large to the acuteness of this problem and how it will negatively affect our joint attempts to build a meaningful “knowledge-based” economy in Indiana. We must point to other states that have taken on this same problem with aggressive means; North Carolina and California, for example, have recently enacted multi-billion dollar academic space bonds for use by the public universities. Other states, especially as the economy reawakens, will surely follow.

IU must convey to the State that it can no longer wait twenty years for new buildings, while fully acknowledging its immense gratitude for the many new buildings and renovations the State has funded in the past. Research space must no longer be seen as an expenditure – dollars lost by the government and the taxpayers who fund it – but as an investment on behalf of all of the State.

Second, IU must change its own paradigm. Some deans suggested that IU could self-fund some research space, perhaps building small-scale or medium-scale, flexible buildings that are designed to be redone internally every ten years. Some of these could be funded through the grant income that is now spent internally and externally, on rent. Already, market rents near IUB and IUPUI are far higher than the cost to build and operate new research space ourselves. Alternatively, IU could utilize gift money or State funds to build “shells” of buildings and expect occupants to build out the interiors through research grant funds from public and private sources, indirect costs, etc.

Another way to self-fund space is to accept that, like desktop computers and printers, research space and the renovation of existing space will be a permanent and ongoing need, and to fund it, IU must annually set aside a portion of the budget to utilize in lump sums when renovations and reconstructions are needed. This adjustment will be

remarkably painful the first time, but it will help keep the current situation from recurring in the future.

Third, IU must work to create the bonding authority needed to self-fund space, without waiting for State biennial processes and to surmount other barriers. We frequently heard that it is much quicker for the private sector to build new space than it is for the University to do so, and in the environment of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, that situation is unacceptable. Therefore, we urge the University and the State, as well as other universities in the State, to remove existing technical barriers and then to develop ways to allow the swift construction and renovation of needed space. IU's and the State's bond ratings are among the nation's best; interest rates are historically low; our existing bonding debt will decline significantly in the near future as old issues are paid off; surely the seeds of a new paradigm lie in these facts.

Fourth, IU must give the construction of space a much higher priority in future endowment and capital campaigns. The University has conducted successful endowment and capital campaigns in the past, though its recent efforts have been focused primarily on faculty chairs and student fellowships. Purdue is now raising funds for up to forty new buildings, and we need to follow suit and exceed that mark if we can. Every new building we could fund privately is one less that has to be requested from the State, and can in fact sharpen our focus to the State. For example, we could seek private funding for Music, Theater, etc., and make the more direct case to the State that Education and Science and Medicine are disciplines whose support from the public is a simple and shrewd investment in the State's economic future. We strongly encourage the Trustees, President and Foundation to give space a very high priority in the new IUB campaign, and to design much of the next IUPUI campaign around space needs.

Fifth, IU's case for the urgent need for more space should be made at every conceivable opportunity. The need for space should become a key "talking point" for University officials in their external and internal conversations. Faculty need to know that attention is being paid to this need and the University is working to solve it, while everyone else needs to be made aware of it.

Finally we strongly recommend that the work and momentum of these Task Forces to address IU's critical need for research space be continued. In particular, we recommend that the University Master Planner, John Belle, be engaged to begin development of a comprehensive master plan for IU that would build on this report and the information we gathered which is presented in the attached spreadsheets. The Architect's Office and the Research Office working together with the Task Forces could develop a charge for the Master Planner based on the findings of this report. Such a widely inclusive process not only will raise the awareness of all stakeholders, but might also generate new ideas for solving the Indiana University research space crisis.

The Research Space Task Forces of IUB and IUPUI  
August 13, 2004

## **Research Space Needs Project Notes on the spreadsheets**

This information was compiled from a variety of sources in academic year 2003-04. All schools, centers and institutes were asked to fill out a survey stating their needs, current and projected, for research space. In some cases, units had detailed plans from which to draw these figures. In other cases, they simply articulated lists of programmatic needs which were converted to square feet by the Bureau of Facilities.

In some cases, pre-existing plans for new buildings or renovations had been drawn up by the Bureau of Facilities and were utilized for this study. Still other projects had been ranked by the Capital Priorities Committee and assigned dollar figures in preparation for internal and state budget request processes. In cases where cost of proposed projects was available but assignable square footage was not, we utilized formulas for cost per square foot by type of space to create workable estimates. On the charts, those formula-driven square footage estimates appear in italics. All other numbers either were generated by the schools themselves or by the Bureau of Facilities, working with the schools.

We believe these numbers to be accurate as estimates of the current and projected situation, but they are by no means definitive, and they will change over time.

## **Members of the Research Space Task Force 2003-04**

### **IUB**

Cathy Brown, Education  
Charles Reafsnyder, International Programs  
Dan Drew, Journalism  
Ed Robertson, Informatics  
Michael Hamburger, Geology/Arts and Sciences  
Barbara Hawkins, HPER  
Harriet Hemmasi, Libraries  
Java Mostafa, Informatics  
Neil Theobald, Office of the Chancellor  
John Applegate, Law  
David Koceja, HPER  
Sarita Soni, Optometry  
Jeff White, SPEA  
David Zaret, COAS  
Ted Widlanski, COAS

### **IUPUI**

Alan Mikesky, Physical Education  
Darrell Bailey, Informatics  
Dolores Hoyt, Libraries  
Greg Lindsey, SPEA  
John Hassell, Business  
Juanita Keck, Nursing  
Kathryn Wilson, School of Science  
Mark Sothmann, Health and Rehabilitation Sciences  
Ora Pescovitz, Medicine  
Pat Fox, Education  
Dominick Zero, Dentistry  
Bob Martin, Office of the Chancellor  
Patrick Rooney, Philanthropy  
Susie Mead, Facilities  
Bill Barton, Social Work  
Bill Schneider, Liberal Arts  
David Ford, Liberal Arts

### **OVPR and Architect's Office:**

Patrick Murray  
Michael Wilkerson  
Karen Adams