CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
DECEMBER 12, 2011
Morrill Hall Room 300

[In these minutes: CLA curriculum project; statement on development opportunities for instructors in active learning classrooms]

[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), Gordon Duke, Jeremy Todd, Brad Cohen, Peggy McCarthy, Barbara Jensen, Broderick Anderson, Roberta Juarez, Ozayr Saloojee (for John Comazzi), Patricia Schaber, Kevin Smith, Keya Ganguly, Jed Overmann

REGRETS: Krishna Jhaveri, John Andrus, Jeff Lindgren

GUESTS: Nanette Hanks, assistant dean for curriculum, College of Liberal Arts Undergraduate Programs; David Langley, director, Office of Human Resources, Center for Teaching and Learning

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

CLA Curriculum Project
Nanette Hanks, assistant dean for curriculum, College of Liberal Arts (CLA) Undergraduate Programs, discussed the CLA curriculum project with the committee. She stated the goal of the project was to streamline and increase transparency around the management of the curriculum and human resources for instructional needs. She stated CLA hires many professional and administrative staff as well as graduate students, and affiliated faculty to teach the 6000 classes it offers. In the past, each department received a designated amount of money and could receive more funds upon request. Ms. Hanks was then responsible for reviewing enrollment in each of the courses and canceling those courses with low enrollment. Ms. Hanks explained with 31 departments with separate budgets and separate curriculum, this resulted in unplaced classes and classes being cancelled at the last minute,.

She stated in order to more effectively manage this process, it was determined that each department would receive a single allocation with an agreed upon curriculum.   Under the project, each department was provided data about anticipated enrollments and asked to review its curriculum. The departments then submitted their curriculum to Ms. Hanks. She reviewed it and looked at historic enrolments, and faculty leaves. Then an agreement was reached on the curriculum that would be offered.

After implementation of the project the number of unplaced courses prior to the start of classes dropped from 200 to ten. And although there are still class cancellations, Ms. Hanks stated this happens sooner in the process. Additionally as a result of the project:

- The Office of Classroom Management knows what the college's needs are,
- Faculty know what classes they are teaching, and
- Students know what courses are offered

Ms. Hanks stated further that requiring departments to submit their curriculum plans as part of the budget process, allows anticipation for curricular pressures, student demands, instructional demands, and allows the college to reserve funds to make any necessary changes and adjustments.

Jeremy Todd asked how the Senate Committee on Educational Policy's (SCEP) review of the liberal arts requirement affected CLA. Ms. Hanks responded that she is reviewing the curriculum and student demand to determine where to shift instructional resources, and historic enrollment data will be used to make recommendations to departments about where resources should be shifted.

Professor Wick asked if there are departments or instructors in CLA that would like to use active learning classrooms or new technologies but are being held back because it can be more expensive to deliver course work this way; particularly because the ALCs cannot hold as many students as a traditional classroom. Ms. Hanks responded that the language skills courses have been hybridized, require more lab space, and are now being requested more often. But she noted the renovation of Folwell Hall has met this need. Ms. Hanks stated the current need is for computer lab space for the psychology statistics and methods courses, and CLA cannot meet this.

Professor Ozayr Saloojee asked if there a technical requirement for students before they can enroll in particular courses. Ms. Hanks stated there is not a requirement that students have a certain level of technology available to them. But it is expected that students will have the capability to use Moodle.

The committee returned to the topic of the space and lab needs for the psychology statistics and methods courses. Brad Cohen suggested a meeting between individuals from CLA-OIT and Ms. Hanks to address the issue.

Ms. Hanks also noted CLA's partnerships with other colleges to combine recourses and share lab paces.

Committee Discussion of Draft Statement on Development Opportunities for Instructors in Active Learning Classrooms
CAS members were provided with the following draft *Statement on Recurring Funding for Faculty*.

> In recent years, the University of Minnesota has provided substantial capital investment in new technology-rich Active Learning Classrooms (ALCs) on campus. To fully leverage this investment, the university teaching community will need to fundamentally

redesign traditional courses by partnering with pedagogy and academic technology experts (see meeting notes from CAS 11/7/11 for evidence regarding impact of such supported transformation). The scale of this transformation is considerable, and transition costs supporting this form of professional development are not typically a component of building or classroom redesign projects.

Central service units like the Center for Teaching and Learning and OIT's Collaborative for Academic Technology Innovation offer regular programming and support to help instructors improve their practice in any learning environment. At present, the fiscal commitment of these offices has resulted in support for a limited number of instructors who are new to ALCs. The demand for services is likely to grow substantially in future years. For example, in the 2010-11 academic year, 35% of all undergraduates enrolled in at least one course in ALCs in the new Science Teaching and Student Services Building. Over time, the hundreds of courses taught in this building and other ALCs across campus can potentially reshape the undergraduate experience. We believe an ongoing financial commitment to support the professional development of the university teaching community in ALCs is both timely and necessary.

The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee recommends a minimum level of funding at X% of new building and redesign projects to incentivize and support faculty and instructors as they restructure their practices to suit the new learning environments the University provides for them and their students.

Professor Wick noted that Mr. Cohen, director, Collaborative for Academic Technology Innovation, OIT and David Langley, director, Office of Human Resources, Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) had drafted the statement, and asked Mr. Cohen to provide background on the statement and walk the committee through it. Mr. Cohen explained the statement arose from J.D. Walker's presentation to CAS regarding research on active learning classrooms (ALCs). This research showed that when faculty members are given support to redesign their courses and develop the skills they need to teach in ALCs, the outcomes for students are substantial. Mr. Cohen said the intent of the statement is to set aside funding for faculty development whenever a new classroom design is brought on-line, or to at least provide funds to incentivize faculty to re-design the way they teach and to develop skills for teaching in ALCs. He stated this would maximize the investment for the University and benefit students. The program would be analogous to the program that sets aside funding for public art when a new building is constructed.

Mr. Cohen noted that his office, OCM, and CTL have been developing faculty development programs and services for instructors teaching in ALCs. But Mr. Langley stated, they lack the necessary resources to support the large number of faculty using spaces like the Science Teaching Student Services (STSS) building. He stated further, that only a small percentage of the instructors working in STSS have received training in the use of ALCs. Moreover, Mr. Langley stated it would take very little funding to provide for faculty development. For instance, only one-tenth of one percent of the cost of a building like the STSS building would be sufficient.

Peggy McCarthy asked if there was any connection between use of the ALCs and receiving training to use the rooms. Mr. Cohen stated providing a preference for use of the rooms to those instructors who re-designed their courses for ALCs was considered,

but no formal mechanism is in place at this time to provide a preference. This presents a challenge because it is not easy to return to old methods of teaching after adapting courses to ALCs. Mr. Cohen stated it would be good to have some mechanism in place to allow faculty who redesign their courses to continue to use the ALCs.

Professor Saloojee asked whether Mr. Cohen and Mr. Langley had considered potential sources of funding other than capital funding. Mr. Cohen responded that the statement was drafted to draw an analogy to funding for public art, but funding could also be attached to new classroom design. Professor Saloojee suggested a system for recurring funds such as a student fee. Mr. Cohen responded that since 2001, in the faculty-student-technology survey, students top request is to have money invested in faculty development, and they state that the greatest barrier to use of technology in the classroom is that faculty do not know how to use it.

Mr. Langley stated with President Kaler's announcement that 1000 new STEM students would be coming to the University and the construction of the new physics building, there would be a strong need for faculty to become experienced in using ALCs.

Professor Wick stated she believes a grassroots approach is needed, and the statement would be more effective if those using the classrooms are requesting the training.

Professor Schaber agreed that funds should be set aside for training, and commented that there is no purpose in putting in the technology if funding is not provided for training to use it.

Mr. Cohen asked if the public art analogy should be included in the statement. Mr. Todd recommended using a tiered funding approach. He suggested base funding, funding from student technology fees, and funding from a percentage of new buildings construction costs. Mr. Todd also suggested adding three bullet points from Mr. Walker's presentation that cull out how effective training is and what an impact active learning teaching techniques have on student learning.

In order to garner support to fund instructor training, Professor Saloojee recommended envisioning the University as a community, and seeing teaching as a common good.

Professor Schaber pointed out that technology fees currently go to every college so the individual colleges must commit to funding training. Mr. Cohen stated that the technology fees are no longer separate, but are part of a lump student fee. He emphasized that what is needed is an incentive to support faculty in re-thinking their courses, particularly if they make the commitment to participate in 18-month intensive training programs.

Mr. Todd suggested following the University of Iowa model of providing three to four day training programs in order to reach a larger group of faculty than could be reached with the intensive training programs.

Professor Schaber suggested that the incentive could be using the ALCs or being able to teach during nonstandard times. Barbara Jensen noted that this would be effective as long as there was a strong demand for the rooms. Professor Kevin Smith stated requiring the training could create demand. Mr. Cohen responded that while this was effective for the University of Iowa, he does not believe the University of Minnesota should follow a coercive model.

Mr. Cohen stated that there are not enough slots for faculty who want to participate in the training being offered. But providing an incentive would indicate the dean or chair of the department believes the training is as important as other work. So it is necessary to create a funding model that indicates that faculty development is important.

Mr. Langley noted that the University recently sponsored a national conference on active learning spaces, and one of the themes that arose from the conference was the need for universities to invest in faculty development and technology enhanced learning.

Professor Wick stated the proposed statement could educate Senators but she believes a multifaceted approach is needed to inform more faculty about the opportunities for training. In order to provide a broader audience for this information, she suggested contacting the Minnesota Daily to write an article about the CTL programs and the positive impact they have on students' learning.

Mr. Todd suggested that the statement could be redraft as a report to SCEP recommending that the President and senior officers fund faculty development, and that the funding could be a percentage of the cost pool. He explained it as an iterative process involving: faculty development, ongoing research that drives building new classrooms, and then a percentage of new construction.

Peggy McCarthy asked about the current source of faculty professional development funding. Mr. Cohen responded that there are multiple sources of funding from colleges and units. But, Mr. Langley noted there is not an umbrella of faculty development funds that crosses all departments. CAS briefly discussed the need for a master plan that brings together and considers all of the professional development funds across campus. It was noted that this would be a provostal level decision.

Professor Wick suggested adding some language in the second line of the second paragraph of the statement indicating there is a suite of possibilities for programming and support. This should be rewritten as statement to SCEP, but should also include some background about the training that is currently available.

Mr. Cohen stated that the STSS building is internationally regarded as the standard for building design with active learning spaces. The University should also create a new paradigm for how to support course redesign and faculty development in the STSS spaces and other ALCs.

Ms. McCarthy suggested looking at how the AHC funded the simulation labs and incentivized their use.

CAS discussed methods of creating timely discussion campus wide about funding. But it was noted that the Minnesota Daily had already written two articles about the STSS building, and that the Board of Regents had also been informed of the ALC research.

Professor Ganguly stated that the CLA faculty members are currently stretched thin and there is a structural impediment for faculty to participate in the type of training being discussed. Mr. Cohen agreed that there must be full administrative support for the training and suggested a "buy out" of faculty time. He also noted that there could be incremental support such as offering a modest stipend.   He emphasized the importance of administrative recognition that professional development is important work and faculty should be paid for it. Professor Ganguly suggested the statement should be channeled through to the deans.

Professor Wick noted that Vice Provost McMaster's is a member of SCEP, and thought that when he reviewed the statement, he might have suggestions for bringing the issue to the deans.

Mr. Cohen suggested that the University of Minnesota Foundation might be a source of support for funding for faculty training.

CAS agreed that Mr. Cohen and Mr. Langley would e-mail a draft of the revised statement to committee members prior to the February 6 meeting. Mr. Cohen suggested that the statement be sent to the Faculty Consultative Committee as well as SCEP, in light of previous discussions by the FCC about faculty development and training.

New Business
Professor Wick asked CAS members to submit recommendations for committee members interested in chairing CAS next year.

Hearing no further business, Professor Wick adjourned the meeting.

<div style="text-align: right">

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office

</div>