

ETSU Fine Arts Classroom Building

Programming Session No. Two

Meeting Notes

September 2, 2015

A meeting was held on September 2, 2015 at ETSU for the continuation of gathering input from the administration and faculty on the program needs for the new Fine Arts Classroom Building. There were five separate meetings during the day and the notes and attendance are divided accordingly below:

First Session: Project Leadership Meeting

Attendees: Dr. Noland, Dr. Bach, Dr. Anderson, Ms. DeAngelis, Jeremy Ross, Bill Rasnick, Eddie Harkleroad, Robert Long, David Kahn (via telephone), Doug McCarty, and Jeff Johnson.

1. The meeting was opened by Dr. Noland who shared his vision for the new building:
 - A. This is the culmination of 30 years of discussion.
 - B. All of the departments remember different promises made over the years.
 - C. The initial programming was done too quickly.
 - D. The reality of where we are now is that we have to shape a program that will meet the budget.
 - E. Listening to the faculty at this point will benefit us over the long term.
 - F. The current facilities at ETSU just do not provide enough space for performances for a 15,000 student university.
 - G. Dr. Noland thinks the emphasis in the new building should be on spaces that don't currently exist like the 750-seat venue.
 - H. The Mathes facility is inadequate: we need a new recital hall, minimum seating of 200.
 - I. We need the dance studios and flexible theatre.
 - J. Dr. Noland wants the design team to listen once more to the faculty and then help the university prioritize the needs – he wants our recommendations.
 - K. The Music Department has extreme needs.
 - L. Dr. Noland sees the performance venues as classrooms.
 - M. Dr. Noland doesn't think the accreditations for the various departments are facility sensitive. Music, Theatre and Art are all accredited. (The recent Music Department accreditation may have mentioned some facility needs.) The Dance program is not yet a degree program nor accredited.
2. Robert Long diagrammed a program that had the 750-seat theatre, a recital hall/choral rehearsal and the Studio Theatre as givens. Also givens, to begin to satisfy the biggest needs of the Music Department, were the Percussion Suite and an Instrumental Rehearsal room. The vulnerable big spaces are the Art Gallery, the Dance Studios and the Recording Studio. There are certain support and public spaces that have to be there to support the given spaces. He outlined the following options:
 - A. No Art Gallery, no Recording Studio but an enlarged Studio Theatre and an Instrumental Rehearsal room.

- B. Includes the Recording Studio and the enlarged Studio Theatre but no Instrumental Rehearsal, no Art Gallery.
- C. Adds back the Art Gallery, keeps the enlarged Studio Theatre and Recording Studio but has no Instrumental Rehearsal.
- D. Includes the Art Gallery, Recording Studio, reduced Studio Theatre and has not Instrumental Rehearsal.
- E. Includes Art Gallery, Recording Studio, and reduced Studio Theatre but eliminates Dance Studios.

Second Session: Programming Discussion with Department of Music and Bluegrass, Old Time & Country Music Studies Program

Attendees: Numerous Music Department and Bluegrass Faculty, Dr. Bach, Dr. Anderson, Ms. DeAngelis, Jeremy Ross, Bill Rasnick, Robert Long, Doug McCarty, Li Wang and Jeff Johnson.

Key Points made by the faculty:

1. The Recital Hall needs to have 200 to 250 seats.
2. The priority for support spaces are as follows:
 - a. An Instrumental Rehearsal room of a minimum of 3,000 square feet, 18 – 22’ high for between 20 and 120 musicians.
 - b. A Choral Rehearsal room of a minimum of 420 square feet, 16 – 20’ high for a maximum of 120 singers, with a flat floor (heavily emphasized).
3. As of F14 there were 118 music majors. There were 75 bluegrass students (including 21 pre-bluegrass).
4. One faculty member suggested moving the “loud spaces” to the new building and leaving the “quiet spaces” where they are. This would give the department the ability to expand into the vacated spaces without having large acoustic issues.
5. One faculty member noted that the Percussion Suite should definitely be moved to the new building.
6. The Music Department chair noted that the Green Rooms need sound isolation and that there should be a rehearsal rooms for up to 15 musicians.
7. A faculty member noted that the Percussion Suite should be near the Recital Hall and obviously sound isolation was needed.
8. The need for the Instrumental Rehearsal room was again emphasized.
9. Student priorities include a Rehearsal room and a lounge area.
10. It was emphasized that the Recital Hall can’t double as the rehearsal space for anyone.
11. A Bluegrass faculty member stated that the building should include the Recording Studio so that every department was represented in the building.
12. A Music Department member stated that the Dance Studios were not a priority.
13. Someone noted that the building should be allocated per the number of students in a major but noted that art had more majors than anyone.
14. The head of the Appalachian Studies Department noted that Bluegrass has little in the new building and asked if any of the appropriated funds could go towards renovation of some existing spaces.
15. It was noted that the Music Department offers one degree with a new concentration in Jazz.
16. The comment was also made that we need to build new spaces that we can’t repurpose in the existing buildings.

17. The final comment was that the needs of the piano students need to be considered.

Third Session: Programming Discussion with the Division of Theatre and Dance

Attendees: Numerous Theatre and Dance Department Faculty, Dr. Bach, Dr. Anderson, Ms. DeAngelis, Jeremy Ross, Bill Rasnick, Robert Long, Doug McCarty, Li Wang and Jeff Johnson.

Key Points made by the faculty:

1. They stated that they liked the increased number of Dressing Rooms and it was acceptable to teach make-up techniques in a Dressing Room.
2. 47 majors as of F14.
3. There was a discussion about having the Studio Theatre instead of the 300-seat proscenium theatre.
4. The set designer asked if the Studio Theatre could be equipped with a tension wire grid in lieu of catwalks. Robert Long stated that this should be affordable.
5. The Theatre Program wants to keep using the Bud Frank Theatre.
6. The Dance Program faculty emphasized the need for new dance studios in the new building.
7. The Studio Theatre should not double as a dance studio.
8. The Theatre Department emphasized they need a new scene shop; current one is very inadequate – one example, has a 3' x 7' doorway all sets have to exit. Also, the floor is tile over concrete; they need a shop with a least part of the floor in hardwood.
9. It was noted that there are plans to introduce a dance major. A letter of intent has been accepted by TBR.
10. The Studio Theatre needs its own Green Room.
11. They liked the Family Restroom at the Clayton Center and want to have one in the new building.
12. It was discussed that the pit lift would be a motorized/manual combination.

Fourth Session: Programming Discussion with the Department of Art and Design

Attendees: A number of Art and Design Department Faculty, Dr. Bach, Dr. Anderson, Ms. DeAngelis, Jeremy Ross, Bill Rasnick, Doug McCarty, Li Wang and Jeff Johnson

Key Points made by the faculty:

1. There are numerous individual and group exhibitions each year (5 – 10 BFA's per semester and 6 MFA's).
2. They currently use the Slocumb Gallery, the downtown Tipton Gallery and the Reece Museum. The Tipton Gallery is not in their control.
3. They also need better exhibition space for travelling exhibits.
4. There is no parking for the public to visit the on-campus galleries.
5. If possible, it would be desirable to have one or two smaller "featured" galleries off the main gallery.
6. The faculty is excited about the potential of the new gallery in that it should allow them to receive more grant funding for more prestigious exhibits.
7. It was also noted that they have been working in collaboration with other university departments in programming and theme exhibitions and being in the same building would further promote these efforts.

8. They stated that the 2,000 square feet currently programmed would be the bare minimum. They would really prefer 4,500 square feet but knew they couldn't ask for that much.
9. While there should be art in a public lobby, lobbies cannot substitute for a gallery.
10. Having a gallery in the new building would show the importance of Art and Design for ETSU.
11. They asked if there could be a small kitchenette in the storage room or nearby the gallery.
12. The final comment was to have a well-proportioned gallery, not too narrow.
13. While not discussed in the meeting, F14 enrollment in Art includes BA 186, BFA 30, MFA 19 students for a total of 235.

Fifth Session: Wrap Up and Next Steps

Attendees: Dr. Noland, Dr. Bach, Jeremy Ross, Bill Rasnick, Robert Long, Doug McCarty, Li Wang, Jeff Johnson

This meeting was held in Dr. Noland's office and the purpose was to discuss the findings of today and to decide the next steps. Dr. Noland again stated his emphasis on building spaces that were currently non-existent or too expensive to build elsewhere; i.e. the need to construct a Recital Hall over more office space. After much general discussion, it was decided that MHM would create a spreadsheet with many of the options outlined in the first session for Dr. Noland to review and discuss with various staff and administration.