Minutes

Present: John Decman, Mark Denney, Kim Edwards, Samuel Gladden, Eric Herrera, Allen Hill, Rebecca Huss-Keeler, Nicholas Kelling, Ju Kim, Mike Livingston, Andrew Reitberger, Debra Ross, Mary Short, Gavin Steiger, Mary Washington, Chloris Yue
Absent: Lisa Coen, Derek Delgado, Pam Groves, Tonya Jeffery, Daniel Maxwell, Russell Miller, David Rachita, Miles Shellshear, Alix Valenti

I. Call to order/Opening remarks
   Dr. Huss-Keeler called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

II. Action Items
A. Approval of minutes - Minutes from November 20, 2018 were approved as presented.

III. New Business
A. Proposals
   Subcommittee members were provided with evaluation forms where they could express concerns or ask questions regarding each proposal. The subcommittee chose not to prioritize the proposals, but rather vote to support or not support each individual request.
   
   1. Human Factors/PsyD Proposal for SSCB 2.102- Dr. Nicholas Kelling presented on behalf of the PsyD and Human Factors programs. Currently, the Human Factors Psychology Program and the PsyD program share a space in Arbor 1315.04.
      o Challenges: The PsyD program must have dedicated research space for their accreditation visit by the American Psychological Association on January 10-11, 2019. As the programs grow, research space has become an issue for continued accreditation.
      o Proposal: Arbor 1315.04 will be reallocated to the PsyD programs. The Human Factors Psychology Program will move to SSCB 2.102. No construction will be needed at this time since both spaces are already set up for their needs.
      o Alternate solutions: None identified
      o Other considerations: Both the PsyD and Human Factors programs have a 100% graduation rate from 2014 to present. The PsyD program has a 100% post-graduation job placement rate. The Human Factors program has brought in $1.6 million in award funds; however, some of the research prevents others from using the currently shared space.
      o Results: Proposal was unanimously supported.

   2. Disability Services Proposal for SSCB 2.102 – Mr. Gavin Steiger presented on behalf of the Disabilities Services Department. Currently, part of the Disability Services team shares a suite with Health Services in SSCB 1.1302, while the Accessibility Support Team shares the Hawk Help Desk in B1632.
      o Challenges: At this time, there are no designated spaces in which Disability Services can conduct test proctoring. This not only affects the ability to provide students with adequate accommodations, but might also affect test integrity. The lack of meeting space has also
presented a confidentiality issues. In addition, having team members in several different offices/buildings makes it difficult to manage and work as a team.

- Proposal: Relocate all Disability Services, including the Accessibility Support Team, to SSCB 2.102. Some construction would be needed to ensure the space meets needs.
- Alternate solutions: Other spaces can be considered, but this space is optimal.
- Other considerations: The space shared with Health Services has decreased; in order to comply with HIPPA regulations, a lobby had to be built. In spite of not having designated space, this academic year, Disability Services expects to proctor over 1000 tests (triple since 2015).
- Results: Proposal was unanimously supported; however, there was some concern that the second floor might not be the best location for Disability Services, considering recent issues with the elevators.

3. Biology Department Proposal for reassignment of Chemistry Labs in Bayou – Dr. Brian Stephens presented on behalf of the Department of Biology and Biotechnology and the Department of Environmental Science.

- Challenges: The current biology labs are too small for the increasing class sizes; in addition, scheduling additional sections to accommodate increased enrollment is difficult. Lab preparation space is also an issue. Material preparation occurs in several research labs and these are then transported to the teaching labs. Finally, research is a requirement for evaluation of promotion and tenure for faculty. Current lab spaces do not meet the needs of the faculty conducting research.
- Proposal: Reassign vacated Chemistry labs on the third floor of the Bayou Building to the Biology, Biotechnology and Environmental Science programs. This includes B3506 and B3520 to be used as teaching labs, B3123, B3218, B3216, B3516 and B3528 for research labs, and B3212, B3214, B3304, B3333, B3331, B3517 and B3602 as support labs.
- Alternate solutions: Convert non-laboratory classrooms or other space into laboratory space; however, this would require more funds than the current proposal. Another solution would be to offer fewer lab sections, but this would not meet student demand and would affect enrollment.
- Other considerations: The biology program has increased from 311 majors in fall of 2014 to 530 in the fall of 2018. The other programs have also grown. The additional labs will provide sufficient lab course sections to allow students to graduate within four years. This will also allow for continued growth in enrollment.
- Results: Proposal was unanimously supported.

B. Results
All three proposals were supported by SAUS members and forwarded to FSSC for consideration.

IV. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 2:04 PM.

A. Next Meeting: Wednesday, January 16, 2019
3:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
SSCB 1.202.07 (Student Orgs Meeting Room)
Overview: This process is envisioned to address the permanent allocation of space for both Academic, Student support, research, administrative, and institutional support. It is not necessary that first there must be a vacant space, though if requested space is not already vacant, significant priority will be assigned to the continuing tenant if the proposal involves involuntary relocation. One-time space use allocation decisions will continue to be made on a first-come-first served, space available basis.

Title of Request: Reallocation of vacated laboratory space by PAS Department

Date of Request: December 5, 2018 Division/Department making Request: Dept. of Biology and Biotechnology, and Dept. of Environmental Science

- General Description of space request:
  (Briefly identify the nature of the space request proposal, what space is being requested, and the operational requirement of the request)

The request is for the reassignment of vacated laboratory space on the 3rd floor of the Bayou Bldg. to Biology, Biotechnology and Environmental Science programs. The following laboratories in the Bayou building are requested to be reassigned: B3123, B3212, B3214, B3216, B3218, B3304, B3331, B3333, B3506, B3515, B3517, B3520, B3526, B3528, and B3602. These laboratories will be used for teaching labs (B3506 and B3520), Research labs (B3123, B3218, B3216, B3526 and B3528) and support labs for teaching and research (B3212, B3214, B3304, B3333, B3331, B3517 and B3602). Additional information on operational use of the labs is included in supplemental documentation.

- Current space use:
  (Briefly outline current space allocated to the program, function, etc. If the Program is new, attach program approval supporting documents)

The current space allocated to the programs include teaching labs and research labs. These labs are used to teach the different sections of lab courses taught by the programs. The research labs are used for faculty research and training undergraduate and graduate students to conduct research and apply the knowledge they learn in formal didactic courses to current independent study research projects and thesis research.

- Challenges from current space use:
  (Briefly identify why/how the current space allocation inhibits the success of the program)

The downward expansion initiative has resulted in a large increase the number of students taking the lab courses taught by the Biology and Environmental Science programs. For example, the Biology Program has steadily increased from 311 majors in Fall of 2014 to 530 majors in the Fall of 2018. The current teaching lab space is inadequate, both in terms of scheduling and physical space, to meet the increased enrollment demands for lab sections. Furthermore, the available lab preparation space is inadequate to meet the needs of the increased number of lab sections. This has resulted in the preparation of materials needed for the lab courses to occur in several of the research labs and then the materials transported to the teaching labs. Additionally, the limited number of research labs has required some faculty to be assigned inadequate space to perform their research that is required for their evaluation for tenure and promotion.

- Alternate solutions not requested:
  (Briefly identify alternative solutions to the challenges identified above and why those solutions are not being sought)

An alternative solution is to convert non-laboratory classrooms or other space into laboratory space. We are not pursuing this solution because reassigning current lab space is more efficient and cost effective than converting non-laboratory space into laboratory space. Another alternative solution would be to offer fewer lab course sections; however, this alternative would not meet the student demand and would likely result the loss of enrollment as students decide to pursue their education at other institutions that are able to meet their educational needs.
Proposal Metrics if applicable:
(Identify what metrics can be used to measure success of the program if this space request is approved, compare to current metrics)

The increase of students' ability to enroll in courses required to complete their degrees and enhanced educational experiences in the courses that are not overcrowded. The increase in research capacity and productivity.

Alignment with Strategic Plan:
(Briefly identify how this proposal aligns with the strategic plan for the University, Division, or Department)

The reallocation of the proposed laboratory space will enhance the ability of the Biology, Biotechnology, and Environmental Science programs to provide sufficient lab course sections that allow students to stay on their course maps and to graduate in four years. The proposed lab spaces will also allow these programs to continue to grow in enrollment and potentially expand their curriculum.

Endorsement:

Requestor: Department and Program Chairs of Biology, Biotechnology and Environmental Science
Name: Brian Stephens                  Email: stephensb@uhcl.edu                  Date: Dec 6, 2018
Phone: ext. 3798                 Alternate: Rick Puzdrowski, Cindy Howard, Lory Santiago

Division/Department: Dept. of Biology and Biotechnology, and Dept. of Environmental Science

Dean, Vice President: College of Science & Engineering

Approve this request: Y / N (circle one)

Provost: YES

Shared Governance Space Utilization and Allocation Committee Comments:

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

SUAC Co-Chair: Rebecca Huss-Reeder
Signature: 

SUAC Co-Chair: Mark Denney
Signature: 12/11/18

FSSC Chair: Chris Ward
Signature: 1/30/19
Overview: This process is envisioned to address the permanent allocation of space for both Academic, Student support, research, administrative, and institutional support. It is not necessary that first there must be vacant space, though if requested space is not already vacant, significant priority will be assigned to the continuing tenant if the proposal involves involuntary relocation. One-time space use allocation decisions will continue to be made on a first-come-first served, space available basis.

Title of Request: Disability Services space request

Date of Request: 11/27/18    Division/Department making Request: Disability Services

- General Description of space request:
  (Briefly identify the nature of the space request proposal, what space is being requested, and the operational requirement of the request)

Ideally, Disability Services (DS) would like to consolidate all of the functions of the office into one physical space to streamline office effectiveness, and staff interaction and supervision. Within the last 5 years, the number of students who are served and the number of professional staff in the office have both doubled. While the number of students requesting services and the services they have requested has significantly increased, the amount of space DS utilizes has actually decreased. DS currently shares a suite with Health Services. Some of this space had to be repurposed as a waiting room for Health Services to comply with HIPAA regulations. In addition to this, the Accessibility Support Team (AST) was moved as well. The AST was originally located in the Hawk Help Desk (B1632). It was moved to B2504 once the Office of Online Programs was discontinued. However, this space was repurposed in Summer 2018. On June 7, 2018, the AST moved back to B1632.

Testing space is our primary concern. The number of tests the office proctors to assist faculty have tripled in four years. DS proctored 252 tests in AY2015, and 789 tests in AY18 (academic year for DS = summer, fall, spring). DS has already proctored more exams this semester than we this past spring. These numbers do not included the total data for finals. Along this trajectory, it is very possible that DS may proctor more than 1000 tests for this academic year (which would be a 400% increase from 4 years ago). Table 1 shows testing data from the past 7 semesters (including the current Fall 2018 semester) as of Monday, December 3, 2018.

Table 1: Tests proctored by Disability Services by semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016 Fall</th>
<th>2017 Spring</th>
<th>2017 Summer</th>
<th>2017 Fall</th>
<th>2018 Spring</th>
<th>2018 Summer</th>
<th>2018 Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Exam Requests</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Requested</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Midterm Exams</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Quizzes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Standard Tests</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Current space use:**

(Briefly outline current space allocated to the program, function, etc. If the Program is new, attach program approval supporting documents)

DS is currently split between two different buildings. The main DS office is located in SSCB 1.302. Within this suite, we have 3 staff offices, 6 testing rooms, a front desk/waiting area. We also share space with Health Services within this suite. The shared space is for the records room, storage room, and copy room/DS student worker space. In addition to the SSB space, we also have space in B1632 for the Accessibility Support Team which we share with the DOS office and the Student Conference. The AST space consists of one office for the full-time staff and one workstation which is shared between the 2 student workers.

• **Challenges from current space use:**

(Briefly identify why/how the current space allocation inhibits the success of the program)

The current space presents three major challenges. First, we do not have enough space to address the increasing number of tests which we are being asked to proctor. The ADA and Section 504 require that universities and colleges ensure that students with disabilities have equal access to all of the programs and services offered by the institution. Many students with disabilities need alternative testing accommodations for their tests due to their conditions’ functional limitations that can impact processing speed, concentration, physical tasks (e.g., writing, bubbling in a Scantron), or how they access information (e.g., a blind student who needs special software to have a test read aloud).

As indicated in the space proposal DS submitted to Dr. Biggers on May 21, 2018 (appendix A), the number of tests we have proctored has more than tripled in the last four years (AY 2015 = 252 tests; AY 2018 = 789 tests). When the AST was located in B2604, we were able to use the 3 offices and the conference table to proctor tests for 6 additional students. Last spring semester, DS simultaneously used all of the DS testing rooms, the AST space, the DS staff offices, the Writing Center’s conference room, and an overflow classroom to meet the needs of all of the students requesting testing accommodations during finals week.

The second challenge that our current space presents is that the staff is already split between two different locations. The three staff members of the AST are located in the Bayou Building. DS conducted an external program review last year in which the office invited three Disability Services professionals from UHCL peer institutions to provide feedback on various aspects of the office. When the committee conducted the external review, the AST was located in B2504. While the external committee felt that the physical space itself was sufficient for the AST to function effectively, they also felt that a combined space would “increase opportunities for cross training, improve supervision, and create more opportunity for staff collaboration.”

Third, the current space does not allow the staff to perform other functions associated with its mission. The primary purpose of DS is to provide institution-wide consultation, advisement, and training on disability-related topics. Some of the training is directed specifically towards students, some specifically for employees, and others that are open to the public. Due to the fact that we must remain open from 8 am to 5 pm, and do not have any space within our current facilities to meet, it is challenging for the office at times to engage in professional development or conduct necessary meetings with various constituents when the staff have to be away from where students are receiving proctored tests. DS also requested an Assistive Technology lab where we could provide students with disabilities with more access to the technologies they may need while being in close proximity to staff who could answer questions as they arise. In addition to providing greater access to the technology, it would also allow the office to provide more hands-on training of the assistive technology, which aligns with an office goal of promoting technological competency within the students.

• **Alternate solutions not requested:**

(Briefly identify alternative solutions to the challenges identified above and why those solutions are not being sought)

For the Fall 2018 semester, DS and the Testing Center are collaborating with each other during finals week to address our need for testing space. The Testing Center has agreed to let DS use their space and staffing during this week. While we are extremely appreciative of their support this semester, this solution is only temporary.
DS recognized that the Testing Center plans to expand the number of tests, exams, and certifications it offers. As a result of this, the Testing Center may not be able to offer this space to us in the future.

- **Proposal Metrics if applicable:**  
  (Identify what metrics can be used to measure success of the program if this space request is approved; compare to current metrics)

More students with disabilities are aware of the DS office and are utilizing accommodations. As previously stated, the number of students who are registered with the office have doubled, and the number of tests DS proctors has tripled.

For the past two years, DS had conducted a student survey each semester. One of the areas examined is the students' perceptions of their accommodations' impact on their academics. Table 2 shows the percentages of students who have strongly agreed or agreed with the following statements for each semester.

**Table 2: Impact of Accommodations on Student Academics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2016 (n=28)</th>
<th>Spring 2017 (n=26)</th>
<th>Fall 2017 (n=26)</th>
<th>Spring 2018 (n=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The accommodations I used made me more confident in the class.</td>
<td>26 (93%)</td>
<td>23 (88%)</td>
<td>25 (96%)</td>
<td>15 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accommodations I used directly resulted in me achieving a higher grade in the class.</td>
<td>21 (75%)</td>
<td>21 (80%)</td>
<td>20 (77%)</td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accommodations I used increases the likelihood I will stay in school and graduate.</td>
<td>24 (86%)</td>
<td>22 (84%)</td>
<td>23 (92%)</td>
<td>14 (82%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to remember when reviewing the data below that the role of the DS office is to ensure equal access to the educational environment for students with disabilities. While the office hopes that the accommodations will help the students academically, they are not intended to guarantee academic success. In addition, there may be other factors that positively or negatively contribute to the academic success of students with disabilities for which DS is not able to account (e.g., academic competency of course material, financial issues, personal issues).

Students with disabilities who did not use their accommodations had higher rates of current GPAs between 0-0.999 (Fall = 9.6%; Spring = 12.9%) than those who did use their accommodations (Fall = 8.0%, Spring = 9.2%). Students with disabilities who did not use their accommodations also had a higher rates of current GPAs of 4.0 (Fall = 15.1%, Spring = 18.6%) than those who did use their accommodations (Fall = 11.6%, Spring = 14.4%). However, students who used their accommodations had higher rates of cumulative GPAs of 3.0 or higher (Fall = 65.2%, Spring = 60.1%) than those who did not use their accommodations (Fall = 54.8%, Spring = 50.0%). Students with disabilities who used their accommodations also had higher rates of cumulative GPAs of 4.0 (Fall = 5.8%, Spring = 7.8%) than those who did not use their accommodations (Fall = 2.7%, Spring = 2.9%).

There was a slightly higher percentage of students who used their accommodations in “Good” academic standing each semester (Fall = 92.0%, Spring = 88.9%), and a lower percentage of those on probation (Fall = 6.5%, Spring = 7.8%). However, there was a higher percentage of students with disabilities who used their accommodations that were on suspension in Spring 2018 than those who did not use their accommodations. These differences are not statistically significant. The 2018 academic year was the first time we requested this data from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness; therefore, we do not have any longitudinal data to which we can compare these findings.
Table 3: GPA and Academic Standing of Students with Disabilities who Requested Accommodations versus Those who did not Request Accommodations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL Fall 2017</th>
<th>TOTAL Spring 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT Requested</td>
<td>Requested *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - .999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1.999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2.999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 3.999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - .999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1.999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2.999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 3.999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Alignment with Strategic Plan:**
  (Briefly identify how this proposal aligns with the strategic plan for the University, Division, or Department)

DS recently moved from the Division of Student Affairs to the Division of Student Success and Initiatives. The DS office was in the process of creating a 5 year strategic plan. However, this initiative was delayed to updates to the UHCL mission, vision, and strategic plan, in addition with the office’s move to a new division which is itself in the process of branding its identity. Therefore, DS is unable to concretely state how the proposal will align with the strategic plan of the University or Division.

However, using the previous UHCL strategic plan, the proposal aligns with Goal #2, which states that “University of Houston-Clear Lake will provide a supportive student-centered campus environment focused on student access and success.” Additional space would allow us to provide students with disabilities an environment in which the DS office could ensure they have access to their testing accommodations. In addition to this, one of the objectives for Goal #2 is to “provide academic and support services to increase student enrollment and retention.” If UHCL does not have the appropriate infrastructure to meet the needs of students with disabilities (an underrepresented population), then these students may not choose to come to or stay at UHCL.

Lastly, one of core pillars of the DS mission statement is that DS “provides individual services and facilitates accommodations to students with disabilities.” Without sufficient space, DS may not be able to assist the faculty in providing these services to a significantly growing population.

**Appendix A:** DS Space Proposal submitted to Dr. Darlene Riggers on 5/21/18

**Endorsement:**
Requestor:   
Name: Gavin Steiger   Email: steiger@uhcl.edu  Date: 11/27/18

Division/Department: Disability Services

Vice President: Steven J. Berberich  Signature: 
Approve this request  O / N (circle one)

Shared Governance Space Utilization and Allocation Committee Comments:

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5.

SUAC Co-Chair: Rebecca Huss-Keefer  Signature: Rebecca Huss-Keefer

SUAC Co-Chair: Mark Denney  Signature: 

Chris Ward, Chair
FSSC

Signature: 


Overview: This process is envisioned to address the permanent allocation of space for both Academic, Student support, research, administrative, and institutional support. It is not necessary that first there must be vacant space, though if requested space is not already vacant, significant priority will be assigned to the continuing tenant if the proposal involves involuntary relocation. One-time space use allocation decisions will continue to be made on a first-come-first served, space available basis.

Title of Request: _PsyD and Human Factors Program Space Reallocation Proposal__________

Date of Request: _11/20/2018________ Division/Department making Request: _HHP/Psychology and Clinical Health and Applied Science Departments________

- **General Description of space request:**
  (Briefly identify the nature of the space request proposal, what space is being requested, and the operational requirement of the request)

  This request presents two simultaneous actions. Arbor 1315.04 would be vacated by the Human Factors Psychology Program and utilized by the PsyD program. In replacement, the Human Factors Psychology Program would occupy SSB 2102, the space recently vacated by the Fitness and Human Performance Program next to the previous Fitness Zone. These location shifts alleviate current concerns regarding accreditation issues as well as research limitations.

- **Current space use:**
  (Briefly outline current space allocated to the program, function, etc. If the Program is new, attach program approval supporting documents)

  **PsyD Program**

  Currently the PsyD Program has no space designated for research purposes creating a potential issue regarding the current attempt for accreditation. The PsyD faculty members also run two other Master's Programs (Clinical Psychology and School Psychology), and both of these programs have no allotted research labs. Current space assigned can only be utilized in an office space capacity which is already being utilized while needs for a research space are not currently being fulfilled.

  **Human Factors Psychology Program**

  Currently, the program is assigned the Arbor 1315.04 suite. This suite includes three rooms currently outfitted as two experimentation areas, one large for group testing and a smaller one for individual testing and a one-way mirror, accompanied by a control room containing video recording equipment enabled in each testing room. This space has allowed flexibility to run multiple types of studies ranging from website and equipment evaluations to Virtual Reality and Serious Game Development.

- **Challenges from current space use:**
  (Briefly identify why/how the current space allocation inhibits the success of the program)

  Recent developments have resulted in the re-evaluation of the current space allocated to the PsyD program in Health Service Psychology and the Human Factors Psychology program. First, the PsyD will need research space for their accreditation. Currently, they have no research space. The visit determining full accreditation will occur in January 2019. This timing necessitates rapid action in the determination of additional research space to respond to the accreditation concern.

  With regard to the PsyD, currently there is no research space allocated to the PsyD program. Further, the PsyD Program is a combination of Clinical Psychology and School Psychology. Both of these programs do not have research space; thus, this would also give the faculty and students in these programs a place to conduct research. With regard to the PsyD program, we are only in the third year of the program, and student just began proposing their dissertations. However, if they do not have a space for data collection, they will not complete dissertations, which will prohibit them from graduating. Further, students from all three programs become more competitive for internships, employment, and further graduate studies when they have been
involved in research. Currently, they have a very hard time completing research projects, thesis, and data collection, as there is no space for students to do independent projects.

Additionally, the Human Factors program has benefited from an increase in enrollment and student success, as well as the success of multiple contracts and grant awards. Recently, the graduate program doubled its cohort size accepting more students (see Table 1 for 5-year enrollment). However, this increase has resulted in a pedagogical issue. This two-year (six semester) program requires students to conduct multiple research experiments in order to gain applied experiences desired by employers. Regrettably, the current space assigned to the human factors program severely limits the ability to run multiple studies as much of this work involves significant setup, such as the labs virtual reality work, restricting the ability to simultaneously run multiple studies. This challenge has resulted in significant scheduling issues. However, these applied research experiences have added to the extremely high success rate of the program, nearly 100% employment in the past five years including alumni employed at Apple, Microsoft, Hewlett-Packard, NASA, Chevron, among many others and was important in being granted accreditation by the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society (one of the only terminal Master's program to receive this accreditation in the nation). Additionally a significant portion of this work is also being done in collaboration with faculty and students from other programs both within psychology and out. To provide some context, during the Fall 2019 semester 26 students along with 8 faculty were attempting to run seven research studies in addition to several class projects that utilized the space for collecting data. Adding to this scheduling difficulty, the two faculty assigned to this program, have also been the recipients of grants and industry contracts which has resulted in hesitancy to pursue additional external funding due to the limited research capacity and priority of our students. Over the last 3 years these two faculty have been involved in external grants and contracts totaling $1.6 million in awarded funds and $5.6 million in submitted applications or ones currently under review. Combined, these issues have resulted in limiting the applied student experiences which has previously maximized their employment success.

- Alternate solutions not requested:
  (Briefly identify alternative solutions to the challenges identified above and why those solutions are not being sought)

While the programs would be willing to evaluate other spaces across campus, this solution presents an expedite solution based on the timing needs of the upcoming accreditation visit. Additionally, the spaces required would require minimal work and cost where other locations may require significantly more renovation and cost.

Recently, discussions have mentioned the possibility of moving either program to the Pearland location. However, this potential solutions has significant issues. The Human Factors Program is a concentration of the General Psychology program with both the faculty teaching with and outside the concentration and students requiring courses taught within and outside the concentration. This challenge would place significant restriction on the operation of the concentration if separated from the general psychology program and current collaborations with nearby entities including NASA. Additionally, the program is currently accredited as within the Department of Psychology. A division of this may require reaccreditation. The PsyD program is in a similar issue in relation to the Clinical and School Psychology Masters degrees along with the General Psychology program. Currently, the PsyD students teach over 25 classes a year in our General Psychology program. Further, all of the programs utilize and train in the Psychological Services clinic, which is housed in Arbor South. Between the three programs (Clinical Psychology, School Psychology, and PsyD), there are over 60 students working in that clinic during the year, with approximately each student being in the clinic 5 – 6 hours per week. Third, within the three programs, students take 5 – 10 classes in the General Psychology Program, and the faculty in these programs teach over 10 classes in the General Psychology Program.

- Proposal Metrics if applicable:
  (Identify what metrics can be used to measure success of the program if this space request is approved, compare to current metrics)

Currently, these programs are valued for their high visibility along with graduate success. For the Human Factors Program in particular, as the more established entity of the two, has demonstrated a very high success rate due in part to the ability to offer an industry desirable experience. With a nearly 100% graduation rate
along with a nearly 100% employment rate, the program has been very well received by industry. Additionally, the program is able to recruit nationally with a significant amount of the cohorts being from beyond the Houston area. The program has also demonstrated a high level of research output along with significant effort in grant pursuits.

With regard to the PsyD, the space would allow for the completion of dissertation, thesis and/or research projects. Currently, research participation, dissertations, and research projects are required as part of the program. Thus, to be successful and to graduate, each student will need a place to complete these dissertations and projects.

* Alignment with Strategic Plan:
(Briefly identify how this proposal aligns with the strategic plan for the University, Division, or Department)

This proposal presents a clear link to all three goals President Blake announced during her investiture. The unique and critical experiences provided by research at the graduate and undergraduate level in the two programs identified help to provide effective education programs and activities. The organization and flexibility of the spaces identified in this proposal allow for more active student involvement as well as a greater ability to seek external funds with the goal of multiplying resources in order to deliver a second—none educational experience. All with the goal to transform graduates into much needed human capital for our region.
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Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HF Program Graduate Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HF Psych program is a 2-year (six semester) MS Degree

Original Proposal

PsyD and Human Factors Programs Space Allocation Proposal

Note: This proposal outlines a reallocation of the current Human Factors Lab (Arbor 1315.04) and the former Human Performance Lab (SSCB 2.102) located next the former Fitness Zone (SSCB 21.03). This proposal does not make any suggestion regarding the use of the Fitness Zone area in SSCB.

Space Needs.
Recent developments have resulted in the re-evaluation of the current space allocated to the PsyD program in Health Service Psychology and the Human Factors Psychology program. First, the PsyD will need research space for their accreditation. Currently, they have no research space. The visit determining full accreditation will occur in January 2019. This timing necessitates rapid action in the determination of additional research space to respond to the accreditation concern.

Additionally, the Human Factors program has benefited from an increase in enrollment and student success, as well as the success of multiple contracts and grant awards. Recently, the graduate program doubled its cohort size accepting more students (see Table 1 for program growth). However, this increase has resulted in a pedagogical issue. This two-year (six semester) program requires students to conduct multiple research experiments in order to gain applied experiences desired by employers. Regrettably, the current space assigned to the human factors program severely limits the ability to run multiple studies as much of this work involves significant setup, such as the lab’s virtual reality work, restricting the ability to simultaneously run multiple studies. This challenge has resulted in significant scheduling issues. However, these applied research experiences have added to the extremely high success rate of the program, nearly 100% employment in the past five years including alumni employed at Apple, Microsoft, Hewlett-Packard, NASA, Chevron, among many others and was important in being granted accreditation by the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society (one of the only terminal Master’s program to receive this accreditation in the nation). Adding to this scheduling difficulty, the two faculty assigned to this program, have also been the recipients of grants and industry contracts which has resulted in hesitancy to pursue additional external funding due to the limited research capacity and priority of our students. Combined, these issues have resulted in limiting the applied student experiences which has previously maximized their employment success.

Proposed Solution.
In collaboration with the PsyD Program, Human Factors program, the Department of Psychology, the Department of Clinical, Health, and Applied Science, and Dean Rick Short, we have developed a zero-cost solution to the issues defined above. In this plan, the human factors program would vacate their current space, Arbor 1315.04, providing the PsyD program with the essential space. In its current form, the human factors lab provides an ideal environment for desired research as it is already configured to include an interview room with one-way mirror, a modular group testing room, and a control room already outfitted with full suite cameras as well as experimental observation software and hardware. In this reallocation, no funds would be needed to renovate the space, nor any
additional funds to purchase furniture. A diagram of the areas of topic can be seen in Figure 1 outlining current areas as well as the proposed reallocation.

In return, the human factors lab would be relocated to SSCB 2102, the former location of the human performance lab, and renamed the VR, Immersive Technologies, and Gaming Lab. This move would leave the former Fitness Zone undisturbed as this space is not included in this proposal and could be instead reallocated to any other university need or function. This reallocation would provide the human factors program with enough space to allow for simultaneous experimental data collection as well as expand capabilities to pursue additional external funding at both the grant and industry contract level. Figure 2 details the location of the human performance lab in relation to the Fitness zone and Figure 3 provides a possible solution of subdividing the space to allow for multiple areas of use including dedicated VR space, computer testing, programming, and student researcher space. In this reallocation, no funds are requested as the open layout would allow for easy and rapid reorganization based on research needs. Additionally, no funds are requested for additional furniture as existing furniture can be reallocated from within the HSH college.

It should be noted that this proposal could be implemented extremely rapidly and completed easily over the winter break. This speed would allow for completion prior to the APA accreditation site visit and minimize potential impacts to student and faculty research and maximize research readiness for the Spring semester.

In summary, this proposal represents a zero-cost solution to address two significant issues that have direct impact on student success as well as program growth. Should any questions arise from this proposal, please feel free to contact Drs. Mary Short (shortmb@uhcl.edu) or Nicholas Kelling (kelling@uhcl.edu).
Figure 1. Current Human Factors Lab and Proposed Reallocation located in the Arbor Building.
Figure 2. Current Human Performance Lab and Proposed Reallocation located in SSCB

Figure 3. Proposed space utilization for the reallocation of the former Human Performance Lab