

Academic Planning
SM 2/10/67

Paper S-51

To: Mr. D.P. Robertson
Secretary, Senate

From: Dr. J.F. Ellis
Acting Dean of Education

Subject: SPACE

September 6, 1967.

The following motion was passed by the Faculty of Education at its meeting on Tuesday, September 5, 1967:

"that the Space Committee be enjoined to set up a sub-committee to deal with the problem of long range space planning, with particular direction for a reconsideration of the adequacy of Phase III planning, and to coordinate with other bodies who are concerned with similar problems".

This motion serves to express the genuine concern of the Faculty of Education for realistic conceptions of long and short range academic planning and building planning in the light of the direct relationship between the two.

Of particular concern to the faculty were the proposed plans for Phase III. In view of past experience with space problems, a serious reconsideration of the original plans for Phase III was deemed essential, to the extent that an independent study should be initiated in consultation with architects who are familiar with alternative modes of construction, and who might be able to offer advice on how space could be developed more economically and with a higher degree of flexibility.

The Faculty of Education views this matter with extreme urgency and requests Senate to take action on it with emphasis on the interaction of space and educational requirements. It was noted at the meeting that the problem of space planning should not be considered a matter exclusively for the Board of Governors, since the direct relationship between space and educational requirements must necessarily preclude consideration of the two in isolation.

The concern of the Faculty of Education grew out of the following kinds of thinking:

1. Enrollment patterns are much better known now than they were a year and a half ago. The need for the numbers of different kinds of labs, tutorial rooms, etc., may now be quite different in the light of new information.

/2....

Academic Planning
SM 2/10/67

-2-

2. Phase III was not planned with sufficient attention given to alternate uses of space. We now have clear evidence that:
 - a. It is costly to re-convert fixed space for one purpose to another, and
 - b. That it is inefficient to use space designed for one purpose, for another.
3. The Faculty of Education is not convinced that there is unanimity in the University on the large group, small group style of course presentation.
4. The Faculty of Education believes that the architectural profession has given a great deal of thought recently to procedures for creating space which, when compared with conventional procedures, are more economical and more flexible.

In a word then, the Faculty of Education believes that it would be tragic for Simon Fraser to proceed with the present plans for Phase III without being certain that:

- a. We were getting the best value for our money
- b. That we were building for flexibility, and
- c. We were attending to educational and enrollment data.

Accordingly, I would propose that Senate request the Board of Governors to authorize a sum of money (say \$2-3,000) to conduct an architectural and educational study of Phase III in order to make certain that existing Phase III plans -

- a. give us the most space for the money
- b. give us the capability of rapid and inexpensive modification of facilities to changing needs
- c. that they meet the demonstrated and projected needs of our teaching and research program.

J.F. Ellis