CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
May 2 2011
Morrill Hall Room 238A

[In these minutes: computer lab/learning environment modernization; classroom support
during CCLRT; recommendation on final exam scheduling policy; committee business]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the
University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported
in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the
Administration or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Susan Wick (Chair), Jeremy Todd, Melissa Cathcart, Roberta Juarez,
Patricia Schaber, Michael Hannon, Jeff Lindgren, Kevin Smith, Keya Ganguly

REGRETS: John Comazzi, Gordon Duke, Jed Overmann

ABSENT: Mary Hable, Emily Bramschreiber

GUESTS: Simin Hickman, Director of Academic Distributed Computer Services; Keith
Brown, Senior Educational Technology Consultant, Jamil Jabr, OIT Computer Labs
Manager; Toni Pangborn, Classroom Support Manager, Office of Classroom
Management

Professor Susan Wick called the meeting to order and welcomed those present.   She
asked the committee members to introduce themselves.

Computer Lab/Learning Environment Modernization
Simin Hickman introduced Keith Brown, Senior Educational Technology Consultant and
Project Manager for the Computer Lab Modernization Project, and Jamil Jabr, OIT
Computer Labs Manager. Mr. Brown provided the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee
(CAS) with a power point presentation. He outlined the goals of the Computer
Lab/Learning Environment Modernization Project:
• research based design,
• rethink the design of and purpose of traditional computer labs,
• foster education and innovation with state-of-the-art space and services, and
• alignment with the University's mission and the Office of Information Technology's
strategic goals

He stated it is time to rethink the design and purpose of computer labs because of the
infusion of technology in the classrooms and the changed demands on students. The
intent is to update and modernize spaces to better support activities occurring in the
classrooms. Also, many students do not need access to computers. Ninety percent of
students report they have their own computers and what they need is specialized software
and services.

Ms. Hickman compared pictures of the old computer lab with the proposed lab. She stated the new lab provides an open feeling and allows students to bring in their own computers and receive services. She then outlined the process in designing the computer lab spaces. OIT spent two days meeting with national computer lab design firm DEGW and OIT stakeholders. They evaluated the current spaces and services, and came up with a pallet of spaces:
- hub space,
- learning studio,
- quiet space, and
- testing centers.

OIT determined it would concentrate on the learning studio and hub spaces. Over the next two years, OIT worked with stakeholders such as the Libraries, OCM, Student Housing and Residential Life, Coffman, and the Vice Provost's Office. Ms. Hickman stated the hub space is an area that brings together many services. It provides access to computers, technical assistance, and large format printing. OIT initially focused on spaces in Walter, Blegen, Humphrey, and Coffman. These spaces were selected because they are owned and managed by OIT. However, due to budget constraints, OIT will begin work only on Blegen 90 as a pilot project rather than all four spaces. This will allow opportunities for feedback and input from students before planning changes for the other spaces.

Mr. Jabr spoke about the services that will be in the Blegen 90 pilot space. He noted there are many people in the location allowing it to be a showroom for the services OIT provides. There will be tech stop services, software support, hardware trouble-shooting, learning bytes, and workstations for both individuals and groups. The space is being developed in collaboration with the Libraries which will be providing peer research consultation.

The pilot space will be used to help determine future directions with similar makeovers likely happening in Coffman and Walter. It will help support new initiatives such as campus wide printing and virtualization. The space is also intended to remain flexible so that it can change with changes in technology. The remodel planning ties into the ITIL one-door model for standardization and efficiency. It is one more location for individuals to receive tier one services for IT needs.

Ms. Hickman stated part of the goal for the pilot spaces is to deliver applications to students in a virtual environment, and she updated CAS on the virtualization project. She stated OIT has been delivering virtual applications to 140 students in the College of Design for the last four weeks. OIT had to receive special permission from ADOBE to virtualize their application. OIT will be surveying the students at the end of the semester to determine how well it worked. A smaller test conducted in Professor Wick's class revealed that there is sufficient wireless access to connect all of the students at once, but there were other issues with the way in which the application was virtualized. She asked for volunteers to have testing done in their classrooms over the summer.

Mr. Brown showed CAS two design options for the Blegen hub space. He pointed out spaces for group work, learning bytes and the casual seating spaces. He also noted the multimedia space. Roberta Juarez asked how the physical space is being designed for disability access. Mr. Brown responded that some of the group workstations would be at different heights with removable stools. He also indicated they would be contacting Disability Services to receive guidance on the issue. Ms. Juarez stated that she is the Disability Services contact for physical space issues. Mr. Brown noted that the designer would be contacting Disability Services.

Ms. Hickman noted that the top part of the space is glass so that it is open and inviting and services are obviously available. There is also a demonstration station for students and parents to see the new computer standards and test the machines. Additionally, there is a printing station where students can pick up print jobs sent from other locations on campus.

Mr. Hannon asked what system is in place for students to backup their work. Ms. Hickman responded that students could use Net files, flash drives, or Google Docs to back up their work. Mr. Jabr provided CAS with the most recent "Service Desk" handout discussing OIT's technology-related customer service and support and it evolution from a "help desk" to a "service desk."

Ms. Wick asked Ms. Hickman to describe a learning studio space. Ms. Hickman stated a learning studio is a teaching facility similar to an active learning classroom. It would have round tables and screens for projection at each table allowing for collaboration between students. There would also be the ability to modify the space to meet one's needs. Ms. Hickman noted OIT hoped to have a learning studio and a hub space next to one another.

Classroom Support During Central Corridor Light Rail Transit (CCLRT) Construction
Toni Pangborn, Classroom Support Manager, stated that the rerouting of traffic due to CCLRT construction would make it more difficult for OCM technician vehicles to reach classrooms in the event of emergency calls. She pointed out that difficulties with crossing the Washington Avenue Bridge, University Avenue, and 4th Street would increase technician response time. She asked CAS for input on the level of tolerance there would be for delays. She also asked CAS members to consider having an alternate plan when technical difficulties occur in classrooms and to consider how best disseminate to the faculty the information regarding delays. Professor Patricia Schaber asked if the technicians always use road vehicles. Ms. Pangborn replied that there is one electric vehicle and OCM is investigating whether Park Services will allow the electric vehicle to be driven on the 10th Avenue bicycle bridge. She also indicated that technicians often walk to their destinations, but traveling to the St. Paul campus and West Bank will present delays. Mr. Todd noted that part of the message that OCM is conveying is that there will be a decrease in the level of service that has been provided for the last ten years. Technical difficulties that would previously have impacted only one class may impact all course sections for the day. Ms. Pangborn noted that preventive maintenance

and morning monitoring of classrooms would still occur but the concern is with emergency calls that require a technician. Jeffrey Lindgren asked if it would be possible to station technicians on both the St. Paul campus and the West Bank. Ms. Pangborn responded OCM is evaluating when the highest level of calls are occurring, what types of calls they are, and in what areas. They are considering hiring a group of students and locating them in hub areas. However, she noted most of the calls occur at the same time and the student workers would be busy during only a short period of the time they are employed. She welcomed other suggestions. Mr. Todd noted that OCM also has partnerships with departments in buildings where there are large classroom clusters. OCM is looking at increasing the number of collaborators who could initially investigate classroom problems.

Professor Wick suggested taking the bus between the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. Ms. Pangborn noted OCM would be measuring transportation time once the construction begins. They are also considering sending technicians on bicycles. Mr. Todd noted that during the summer, the transit way would be closed between Malcom Avenue S.E. and 23rd Street. He noted additional impacts on OCM would be a larger bus stop outside of the OCM office and construction on Northrop Memorial Auditorium. Michael Hannon asked how long the construction would take. Mr. Todd responded that Northrop is scheduled to open in the fall of 2013. Washington Avenue will be open to busses in 2013 and the light rail will be open for ridership in 2014. Mr. Todd noted further that the Amundson and Ford Buildings are impacted by the CCLRT construction, and will be off-line for the summer. OCM has not been notified about whether Amundson B-75 will be open during the construction period. So a number of large enrolment course sections that would have been located on the East Bank have been moved to the West Bank. Professor Wick noted that the general transit time allowed between campuses might not be enough. Mr. Todd thought that it would be adequate as long as walking is available. He recognized that there might be an issue for individuals traveling to classes between Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Recommendations to Senate Committee on Educational Policy re: Final Exam Scheduling Policy and Procedure

Professor Wick reminded the committee of last month's discussion with Sarah Kussow, OCM Course Scheduling Manager, regarding final exam scheduling policy and procedure. The policy is available at:
http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/EXAM.html Professor Wick stated the two main issues CAS discussed were:
- The amount of time OCM staff spends scheduling rooms for exams that are never utilized, and
- The policy's failure to speak to final and capstone projects.

In response to the first issue, CAS recommended having departments poll the faculty the second week of classes to determine if they would need a room for final exams. The department would then notify OCM.

Professor Wick asked the committee for additional feedback on these issues in order to draft a recommendation to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP). Professor Schaber asked if rooms are automatically scheduled for undergraduate courses. Mr. Todd responded that OCM tentatively holds a room for all classes whether or not the instructor indicates on ECAS that they will be giving a final exam. Professor Schaber thought asking departments to poll instructors might potentially cause miscommunication. Professor Wick stated there could be an assumption that a final will be given, and then the department could specifically ask professors to release the room if they are not giving a final. The committee discussed whether an opt-in or opt-out system would work better. Mr. Todd stated that opting out might be the better approach because requiring instructors to opt-in provides greater liability that OCM might fail to schedule a room for a final exam.

Professor Wick asked what percentage of scheduled rooms is not being used. Mr. Todd stated that it was about 25% of the rooms being scheduled. Professor Wick suggested and CAS agreed to recommend to SCEP that it consider implementing a policy that requires instructors to opt-out of a scheduled classrooms the second week of any academic term if they will not be giving a final exam.

Professor Wick stated the next issue for the committee's consideration is where capstone projects fit into the existing final exam policy. Professor Schaber noted that she does not give final exams, but instead gives final papers with presentations. It is her understanding of the policy that final papers cannot be turned in before the final exam takes place. She indicated this disadvantages her because it takes more time to grade a final paper then a final exam. It would be easier to collect final papers at the end of a course rather then during the final exam week.

Professor Wick stated SCEP should review and clarify where major projects fit into the final exam policy. Professor Schaber asked if the policy is for both graduate and undergraduate education. She indicated she had always assumed it applied to graduate students. Mr. Todd noted it was focused at undergraduate education. Professor Wick commented it would be good to ask SCEP to clarify whether the policy applies to undergraduate or graduate students. Professor Ganguly noted that in some departments graduate students teach undergraduates and applying the policy to graduate students may adversely impact them.

Professor Schaber suggested the policy should be less restrictive and leave the decisions about how to handle final examinations up to the individual instructors and their students. Brad Cohen asked if there are policies that govern assessments other than exams. If there are not, he suggested that SCEP should consider a robust review of the policy so that it also addresses new forms of assessment practices such as major collaborative projects, experiential learning, and service learning. This would help meet the policy goals of protecting students from burdensome exam schedules and helping instructors to turn in their evaluations in a timely manner. Professor Schaber noted that reviewing the exam policy might require a deeper examination of education policy.

Professor Wick agreed it would be important to determine if there are other policies dealing with assessments and how they relate to the final exam policy. Mr. Cohen stated it would be important to pay attention to defining what type of assignments cannot be due before the scheduled final. Professor Kevin Smith indicated it would be useful to give examples in order to frame the question. Professor Wick noted that there has been a change in the manner of assessments, and there should be additional guidance to insure students are protected from having major papers due the last week of classes. Mr. Cohen stated that it is also important to make sure that faculty are able to process assessments in a reasonable amount of time. The policy should not drive faculty to give multiple-choice assessments in order to turn in grades within the three days allotted by the policy. Mr. Hannon asked if the policy requires every class to have a final exam. Mr. Todd responded that the policy encourages final exams but does not require them.

Professor Schaber noted that her department would no longer allow course fees to be included in the cost of mailing finals in the course fees. Professor Smith stated the 72-hour rule should be reviewed to allow additional flexibility in returning grades in courses that require more grading time. Professor Wick noted this might impact financial aid decisions. Melissa Cathcart noted that the requirement that grades be turned in within 72 hours is a MNSCU rule.

Planning for 2011-12
Professor Wick asked committee members to recommend issues for CAS to consider next fall. Mr. Cohen suggested CAS receive an update on research and evaluation of the active learning classrooms. He noted the findings suggest substantial payoffs for students and faculty in the active learning classrooms.

Professor Ganguly stated the distribution of time across three and four credit courses in CLA is arbitrary, and asked Mr. Todd for his input on this issue. Mr. Todd stated that most of the correlations between three and four credit courses occur in the curriculum review committee at the college level. He stated that CLA had some pilot projects regarding curriculum review and its impact on classrooms that might be of interest to CAS.

Mr. Smith asked how the proposed merger between CAS and STCFSS had been resolved. Professor Wick responded that the merger would not be occurring, but CAS' reporting relationship would be changing. It will be reporting directly to SCEP and will no longer report to Finance and Planning (F&P).

Toni Pangborn suggested the committee should consider prioritizing which classrooms would be receiving resources.

Professor Schaber asked if Constituent Relationship Management (CRM) would impact OCM. Mr. Todd responded that the initial implementation would be in admissions and OCM might be involved in about a year. Professor Schaber suggested CAS might want to gain a better understanding of CRM and how it relates to OCM.

Mr. Cohen suggested CAS consider what metrics are most valued in thinking about classroom use and whether any should be added.
Mr. Todd suggested a report on the summer classroom updates.

Professor Wick asked committee members to send additional ideas to Dawn Zugay, Senate Staff, at zuga0001@umn.edu.

Old Business:
Update on Statement on the Funding for Classroom Facilities and Technologies
Professor Wick updated CAS on her meeting with F&P regarding the Statement on Funding for Classroom Facilities and Technologies (Statement). She reported that F&P agreed to support the Statement, but it wanted to add a comment following the last paragraph of the Statement acknowledging the state of the budget, and that all units are suffering. The Statement will be on the May 5, 2011 University Senate agenda. Mr. Todd noted that F&P recognized that OCM received a draconian cut that was much steeper then the rest of the institution had borne. Professor Ganguly asked if Professor Wick got a sense of F&P's relative priorities. Professor Wick stated she did not have a good sense of this. However, some of the F&P members recognized that classroom maintenance is a main mission of the University and should not be taken lightly.

Mr. Cohen commented part of the Statement's intent was to articulate the importance of planning for the lifecycle of classrooms. And it is not effective to fund for the birth of classrooms, infrastructure or technologies, but to fail to fund them further. Mr. Todd responded that F&P acknowledged the University has done well at initial investment but has not done as good a job funding the on going needs, and this was part of F&P's rationale for supporting the Statement.

New Business:
Mr. Todd informed the committee that a large number of data projectors would not be shipped this summer because of the earthquake in Japan. OCM found an alternative source for some of the projectors. It is still planning to update about 70 rooms this summer in addition to the 28 classrooms in Folwell Hall that will be coming online for fall semester. Mr. Todd noted that about 100 data projectors are scheduled to be replaced this summer.

Hearing no further business, Professor Wick adjourned the meeting.

> Dawn Zugay
> University Senate Office