1. Approval of Minutes for April 2, 2015. Proposed minutes are attached.
2. Conclusion of discussion on Space Allocation Guidelines. After the last meeting I circulated what I took to be the consensus guidelines that emerged from our deliberation, subject to amendment in subsequent discussion. There have been a few positive comments via email, but we should see if we can come to an agreement on at least a working list of recommendations. We should discuss briefly if possible how to proceed with our commitment to develop a comprehensive planning policy, but this discussion should be procedural only since there are other important items on the agenda.
4. Space Update.
1. Approval of Minutes from April 2, 2015. Minutes were approved as proposed.

2. Conclusion of discussion on Space Allocation Guidelines. Jim opened the dialogue by explaining the aim of today’s discussion, namely to approve a set of short-term space allocation guidelines. The initial discussion started with reviewing a draft document of guidelines for space allocation that Jim developed based on the discussion from the previous meeting on April 2. Ned commented that for the short-term the draft document would be sufficient, but the long-term policy would need to be more complex. Jim agreed with Ned. Rob said that he found the draft guidelines very helpful and is already incorporating ideas from the document into thinking about space allocation. Tom suggested qualifying the guideline on relinquishing offices after projects of a fixed duration with the following language: “unless there is demonstrated progress toward a new project.” Another guideline—on determining priority for space based on scholarly or artistic productivity—was qualified with the following: “as determined by the Provost’s office in consultation with the Office for the Advancement of Research.” Tom made a motion to adopt the guidelines as amended and forward them as recommendations to the President. A discussion ensued on how to distribute these guidelines to the college community if the President approves them. The motion passed with a vote of: Y-7 N-0 A-1. Jim asked for volunteers to work as a subcommittee on a more comprehensive policy. Ned, Tom and Jim volunteered; Tom will work on the research sections and Anthony Carpi will be asked if he is interested to work on them as well.

3. Budget Update. Rob said that he will share the all funds budget report in May with the committee. He is reasonably confident that the deficit will be covered; this will be done by CUNY advancing the energy savings. He also said it is reasonable to assume that the College will end this year with a balanced budget.

4. Space Update. Rob opened with explaining that it does not appear the completion of Haaren Hall will be done in a timely manner. He then spoke about how the classroom utilization schedule still needs work. There are plans to add load to Westport because the classrooms are underutilized, and the space is not filled. Tom suggested giving the reconfigured grid to the chairs as soon as possible so they can notify faculty in advance. Rob also explained that there is still the possibility that the College will have North Hall for the fall semester. Ned suggested using the old procedure to schedule classes. This policy gave each department a number of classes that can be scheduled in a period; this forced the departments to schedule classes in less crowded periods. Rob explained that Bob Troy will be working on assigning the classes. Rob said that the consultant’s final report will be presented to the committee. It appears that the academic departments will all be in the New Building/Haaren complex. He also explained that it appears there will be an adjunct resource space on every floor with a place to access a computer, locker and phone. There
was a discussion on when the data behind the consultant’s presentation on March 24 will be brought to the committee members. Rob ended by explaining that the current space plans are all contingent on Westport being finished because North Hall cannot be emptied until this occurs.
A. General Considerations
   1. Faculty or staff eligible for a private office must not occupy more than one office.
   2. All academic departments should be located in the New Building/Haaren block. [this of course
       has been adopted as a formal recommendation by the subcommittees]

B. Considerations for assignment of part-time Faculty
   1. Proximity to academic department should guide workspace assignments.
   2. All instructors should have access to a phone, computer, and networked printer, as well as a
      place for leaving personal belongings for the day.
   3. Instructors should be able to arrange a space to meet with students on a day-to-day basis.
   4. It is preferable to have multiple smaller spaces than just a few very large spaces.
   5. Instructors who teach two or more courses should get priority if choices have to be made about
      the allocation of space or other resources.

C. Considerations for assignment of space other than personal offices (Auxiliary space, such as labs,
   studios, offices for support staff on large grants, project meeting spaces)
   1. Space attached to projects of a fixed duration should be relinquished at the conclusion of the
      project.
   2. Personal office assignments should be in proximity to auxiliary assigned spaces.
   3. Pre-tenure faculty should have priority for their auxiliary space needs.
   4. In general, priority for auxiliary space assignments should be based on scholarly or artistic
      productivity.