

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Finance and Planning**  
**Tuesday, April 3, 2012**  
**2:00 – 4:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Russell Luepker (chair), Martin Caride, Sarah Chambers, Will Durfee, Susan Hupp, Kara Kersteter, Cody Mikl, Kathleen O'Brien, Richard Pfitzenreuter, Michael Rollefson, Ann Sather, Karen Seashore, Arturo Schultz, S. Charles Schulz, Michael Volna
- Absent: Brittany Bergemann, Catherine Fitch, Lincoln Kallsen, Ruth Lane, Fred Morrison, Gwen Rudney, Terry Roe, Thomas Stinson, Aks Zaheer
- Guests: Bob Baker (Parking and Transportation Services); Professor Susan Wick (chair, Classroom Advisory Subcommittee)
- Other: Associate Vice President Laurie Scheich (Auxiliary Services), Lonetta Hanson (Parking and Transportation Services)

[In these minutes: (1) football game-day parking; (2) update on light-rail construction; (3) cell phone reimbursement policy; (4) faculty development fund for use of classroom technology; (5) funding for classrooms and technology; (6) updates from the chair]

**1. Football Game-Day Parking**

Professor Luepker convened the meeting at 2:00 and welcomed Mr. Baker and Vice President O'Brien to discuss football game-day parking and to provide an update on light-rail construction.

Vice President O'Brien began with the game-day parking matter and noted that the campus has now had three years of experience with football in the new stadium. They are reviewing what they have learned and what can be improved.

Mr. Baker distributed copies of slides and reported on the parking and shuttle arrangements for football game days. The major points made in the discussion were these:

-- About 75% of patrons arrive at games no more than three hours in advance of kick-off for tailgating. The number of patrons who tailgate has declined slightly over the three years. They do not permit tailgating in buildings (ramps) for safety reasons. (Vice President O'Brien reported that many Big Ten institutions have a tradition of tailgating that begins many hours before the game starts; because Minnesota has not had football on campus for many years, that tradition does not exist here, and there are people working on developing a program for tailgating.)

-- The facility capacity for parking for football games (which is not the total campus parking capacity) is 14,380 spots. For the 2011 football season, 8,617 of those spots were used for games. It was suggested

---

\* 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

that because several thousand of the game-day spots are not being used, they should consider changing the practice (back) to allow faculty and staff who have regular contracts to park in their home facility even on game days. Mr. Baker explained that no one is excluded from parking, and for those with contracts on the West Bank or St. Paul, they may park in their home facility. For the East Bank, they have made modifications in response to requests to his office, and when there are classes scheduled they have tried to make accommodations.

-- Use of the shuttle from St. Paul parking has increased significantly over the three years; use of the West Bank shuttle has declined substantially. They are likely to discontinue the West Bank shuttle and advise people to use the normal campus shuttle (which operates on Saturdays) or #16 MTC buses.

-- Mr. Baker highlighted the various routes to and from the campus that people can use on game days.

-- Average time to empty the parking facilities after the games was 1:05 in 2010 and 1:22 in 2011. The 2011 times were longer because Washington Avenue was closed. Clearing time for football games is less than for other events in the stadium (e.g., the U2 concert) because everyone tends to leave a concert at once whereas people begin leaving a football game early, particularly if the score is lop-sided.

-- They will be able to accommodate any increase in parking should the football team begin winning and attracting more patrons, but the exit time may be somewhat longer. Mr. Baker commented that people in the Twin Cities are accustomed to leave 30 minutes before an event (any event) and be seated on time—and to depart events and arrive home in 30 minutes. That is the mentality in the Twin Cities. Around the country, people have a quite different view and expect transportation to and from events to take much longer. With increased attendance, if it happens, it will take longer to leave. Vice President O'Brien said that when the Central Corridor light-rail trains are operational, however, that may relieve some of the potential congestion.

-- Mr. Baker said that programs in Dentistry could have parking spots available but they might not necessarily be in the Washington Avenue ramp. They will, however, try to accommodate the programs in the Washington Avenue ramp to the extent possible.

-- Vice President O'Brien reported on the status of negotiations with the Vikings should they need to play in the University's football stadium for some period when a new stadium is being built. The capacity for Vikings games, she pointed out, will be determined by the code official and no one else, based on safety concerns.

## **2. Update on Light-Rail Construction**

Mr. Baker next distributed copies of another set of slides and reported on the status of the construction of the Central Corridor light rail train tracks. The significant points made were these:

-- The heavy construction on the campus should be completed by Thanksgiving, perhaps earlier (that includes the roads, sidewalks, bridge, landscaping, etc. There are some what-ifs for buses and bikes; full access for them may be somewhat delayed because of the need to construct poles and other elements of the system. But for pedestrians the situation will be greatly improved.

-- Mr. Baker reviewed the construction status on the West Bank, the Washington Avenue Bridge, the East Bank, and Stadium Village, and the traffic impact in each area.

-- Professor Seashore said that the notices and updates have been very helpful. Vice President O'Brien said they appreciate everyone's patience and that they are very concerned about pedestrian and bicyclist safety. Mr. Baker said that as track is laid along Washington Avenue, they will maintain temporary crossings for pedestrians.

-- Professor Shultz noted that the time to get between health sciences facilities on Riverside Avenue (e.g., Amplatz Children's Hospital) and the Academic Health Center has increased significantly for medical residents and others. Is there another way to get across the river? That has been discussed for at least 40 years, Vice President O'Brien said, including a shuttle across the river, but the options have always been too expensive. Once the construction is completed and the light rail trains are in operation, the time required for the trip should be reduced noticeably.

Professor Luepker said he wished to echo Professor Seashore's compliments on the helpfulness of the updates that have been provided to the campus community. The construction has, in his view, actually been less bothersome than he had been led to expect. Mr. Baker thanked the Committee for the kind words but warned that the impact of construction would be worse this upcoming summer—as the major construction wends its way towards completion.

[Later in the meeting, Mr. Rollefson reported that Mr. Baker had said, before the meeting started, that there would be no increases in parking rates next year, for the fourth year in a row. The Committee also discussed the extent to which Parking and Transportation Services accommodates requests for parking for classes on game days. Mr. Baker seemed to understand there is a problem, Professor Luepker commented. The problems can be ironed out, Professor Seashore agreed, but doing so should not be up to individual faculty members. In the case of Professor Olin's patients, it is a medical issue and they should be allowed to park in the Washington Avenue ramp. People coming to the football game can park in the East River Road ramp.]

### **3. Cell Phone Reimbursement Policy**

Vice President Pfutzenreuter next raised with the Committee a question about the University's policy on reimbursing employees for cell phones used for business purposes. The University has reimbursed employees since 2005; some individuals have data plans and some do not. About 950 people receive a cell-phone allowance. They have known for a while that the reimbursement rates are somewhat higher than they should be because the cost of the technology has dropped in recent years. They have discussed this issue both with President Bruininks and now with President Kaler and agree that the policy should change. The matter is complicated by the convergence of various technologies: When is a cell phone a computer? A Kindle? He said that Mr. Volna would explain the options.

Two points bear on the discussion, Mr. Volna said. One, they want to cut University costs, especially given that, as Mr. Pfutzenreuter noted, the market has driven the costs of the technology down. The IRS now allows reimbursement tax free without "grossing up" an individual's income. At present the University's reimbursement grosses up the income of those who have reimbursable cell-phone costs. Eliminating the grossing-up and reducing the reimbursement to an amount closer to current market rates would save the University about \$400,000 per year.

The second point is the goal of saving money without adding an administrative burden, Mr. Volna explained. To provide the cell phones tax-free requires documentation/verification that they are for business purposes. That verification would require additional work, something that many administrators do not support.

So what should the University do? The collective view of the unit fiscal officers is to grandfather those who are currently being reimbursed but not provide the benefit in the future, Mr. Volna said. In their view, "show me someone who does not have a cell phone." It is difficult to measure business use, and some universities have taken away the reimbursement cold turkey. The University cannot provide a flat amount per month to employees because the reimbursement cannot exceed the actual cost (it then becomes additional income that must be reported). Plans cost different amounts, and employees would have to document that the cost was equal to or more than the flat reimbursement amount.

25% of the cell phones the University reimburses for are held by faculty and staff in Minnesota Extension, Mr. Volna said. Those people use the phones on their work out in the field and they do not want to dissuade Extension employees from doing so.

Committee members discussed various options that the University might consider, including both the cost and the administrative work that would be associated with each. Professor Schultz concluded that with technology changing, it will get messier to extract business use, and that as few people as possible should receive reimbursement. Mr. Pfutzenreuter agreed that it is a quagmire that will get worse. The best way to reimburse current users is to provide them additional income that is taxable, and then the associated accounting/verification/reporting issues go away.

Following additional discussion that touched again on the needs of Extension personnel and those of clinicians in the Medical School, Professor Luepker summarized the comments by saying that the administration should pursue cost savings, everyone recognizes that the costs of technology have fallen, many plans now have unlimited minutes for a small amount, and that the Committee has no other advice to provide. No matter what the administration does, some people will be unhappy. Those for whom a cell phone is an essential part of their job should not be put at a disadvantage by any policy change. Professor Durfee said he believed that there would be support in the University community to stop paying for cell phones.

Professor Luepker thanked Messrs. Pfutzenreuter and Volna for bringing the issue before the Committee.

#### **4. Faculty Development Fund for Use of Classroom Technology**

Professor Luepker next welcomed Professor Wick, chair of the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) to bring two recommendations to this Committee.

The first item was a recommendation for funding for faculty development in the use of technology in classrooms (appended to these minutes). Professor Wick explained that the Twin Cities campus has become nationally (and internationally) known for its active-learning teaching, especially in STSS, and to the best of her knowledge it has the largest student capacity for active learning of institutions in the world. What has come to the attention of CAS, through student and faculty surveys, is

that many do not know how to effectively use the space or the technology in active-learning classrooms. The proposal to provide faculty development is intended to address that problem. The average student on the Twin Cities campus has one active-learning class per semester.

CAS proposes development of a fund to promote effective faculty use of technology in active-learning classrooms. There is accumulating data that the use of such classrooms does affect student learning—and it is an across-the-board impact, on students in all demographic categories.

Professor Luepker agreed that if he were scheduled in one of the active-learning classrooms, he would have no idea how to use the technology. If the funding proposed by CAS were provided, how would the money be spent? Professor Wick said that the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) provides some instruction in use of technology, and there is a cohort of faculty who participate in a program through the Office of Information Technology that is 18 months and very intense. CAS is not recommending such an intense program, but one that would allow CTL to offer seminars and perhaps some released time.

How much money does CAS believe would be needed, Professor Luepker asked? In the case of the building funds, if the University decided on a program analogous to the program for funding public art, it would be about 0.25% of the building cost, Professor Wick said. (A subsequent check of the public art program found that it "encourages state building projects with construction or renovation budgets of \$500,000 or more to use up to one percent of the total construction budget to purchase or commission original artwork for the site.")

Mr. Rollefson observed that under the current budget model, revenues flow through the deans. Does the CAS recommendation assume that the deans do not have the funds to support such faculty development—or that they are not interested in doing so? Professor Wick said she did not know about all deans, but the dean of her college is very supportive of efforts to enhance teaching. Professor Seashore reported that her college has also funded training in technology-enhanced instruction and the people who participated thought it was fabulous. The training showed up in courses, Professor Hupp added. Given their experience, Professor Seashore commented, it should be incumbent on deans to support the faculty in this way. She also thought that the faculty in her college would be more interested in a college-sponsored opportunity than a University-wide event. There are also people in one's college that one can call on for help, Professor Hupp said.

Professor Chambers asked how the funds would be distributed, assuming faculty would participate. If the administration agreed to provide the funds, could they go to the colleges? That is completely open, Professor Wick said.

Professor Shultz said that many faculty members ask if there are classes that can assist them in their academic work patterns, such as writing papers, obtaining references, etc. Are there classes like that? It would be great to teach faculty how to use technology to transmit knowledge, and that could include preparation of scientific papers, graphics, bibliographies, etc. Professor Wick said that University Libraries offer such courses every year.

Professor Durfee said he is a big fan of anything that helps the faculty enhance their teaching. However, the proposal lumps active learning methods and instructional technology together when in fact

they are not always connected. For active learning spaces, it is the configuration that matters most, not the technology. He said he would support anything that would help.

Mr. Mikl said it could be beneficial to have an explanation of what could be learned—that it would be something more than connecting cables. Professor Wick said her understand of what CAS is interested in is getting instructors to the point where they are not afraid of technology and know how to structure coursework to make best use of the student table configuration of the active learning classrooms.

Professor Luepker summarized by saying that the proposal needs fleshing out with more specifics. Anything the University can do to encourage better teaching it should do; it has invested in expensive classrooms and some faculty may not be using them most effectively. Professor Chambers said the proposal also needs to be more specific about how the money would be raised and how the training would be provided; the first three paragraphs are quite specific but the last one is not. And there are examples of what the colleges have done, Professor Seashore said; there would have to be agreement about the incorporation of technology appropriate to the disciplines.

## **5. Funding for Classrooms and Technology**

The Committee turned next to a CAS Statement on Funding for Classroom Facilities and Technologies (also appended to these minutes). Professor Luepker recalled that Professor Wick visited this Committee last year about these budget trends in support for classroom maintenance.

The numbers are familiar, Professor Wick said, and the point is the same. Building new space is great, but it must be maintained, and deferred maintenance is more expensive in the long run. For classrooms, the recurring funding available has decreased and the square footage that the Office of Classroom Management (OCM) is responsible for has increased because it is now also responsible for student study space.

The update to the budgetary figures in the statement are that OCM will receive funding for \$2 million to deal with classrooms in Keller, Borlaug, and Vincent, and study space in Willey and Wilson Library—but this is a loan that OCM must repay, Professor Wick reported. OCM will also receive a non-recurring \$500,000 to deal with the highest-priority projects. This is a good-news, bad-news message, Professor Wick commented, because OCM will have to begin repaying the loan at \$277,000 per year starting in FY14.

Professor Durfee asked which cost pool the funds for OCM come from, and if there is more to OCM, what is reduced? The money comes from the undergraduate education cost pool, Dr. McMaster's office, Professor Wick reported. So if the colleges do not pay an increased tax, money will have to come out of other budgets, Professor Durfee concluded. Mr. Rollefson recalled that Vice Provost McMaster talked with the Committee and explained that there were higher priorities in his office.

Professor Luepker said that when Mr. Todd, the Director of OCM, was on this Committee, he made an impassioned plea for more funds for classrooms, so the Committee asked Dr. McMaster to visit. He said that he personally believes it important to take care of facilities—and seeing the proposed bonding bill, he worries that there may be further degradation of University facilities.

Professor Seashore said that when she came to the University 25 years ago, classroom space was so awful that students would tell her that their high schools looked better. Then there was a period when that was not true, but now the classrooms are again declining rapidly. The K-12 schools, even in tight times, are not cutting classroom budgets because they know that the environment one teaches in is important. This is not OK, she declared—students pay a lot of tuition and expect to have functional classrooms with furniture that can be rearranged for educational purposes. It is reaching a crisis point in some buildings, she concluded.

Moreover, as the campus talks about adding a third semester, there will be added wear and tear on classrooms, Professor Luepker pointed out. He summarized by saying that the Committee is supportive of the statement that CAS has adopted.

Professor Luepker thanked Professor Wick for bringing the items to the Committee.

## **6. Update from the Chair**

Professor Luepker updated the Committee on three matters.

-- Vice Provost Schroeder responded to the message that he sent following Dr. Schroeder's meeting with the Committee. He urged Dr. Schroeder to be more transparent in the future in making decisions and to deal with the issues raised, in particular taking into account size in quality metrics. The Committee suggested that the issues be put on the agenda again.

-- President Kaler has agreed to meet with the Committee to discuss the issues it has raised; a meeting time will be scheduled.

-- With respect to the issue that Professor Cramer asked the Committee to look into, financial aspects of course "poaching," he has met with Vice Provost McMaster to see the numbers and will meet with Deans Crouch, Elde, and Parente to get an idea of the nature and extent of the problem before he brings it to the full Committee. He said he worries that there could be anecdotes causing angst but that the numbers may not be large.

Professor Luepker adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

\* \* \*

## **RECOMMENDATION ON FUNDING FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

In recent years, the University of Minnesota has provided substantial capital investment in new technology-rich Active Learning Classrooms (ALCs) on campus. Evidence to date suggests that the impact on teaching and learning is considerable, and this impact is further and dramatically enhanced by appropriate course redesign to fit these new spaces. Indeed, with appropriate faculty development support, redesigned courses in ALCs lead to statistically significant learning gains across the student

population. See <http://www.oit.umn.edu/research-evaluation/selected-research/learning-environments/index.htm> for more details. To fully leverage investment in new classrooms, the university teaching community will need to fundamentally redesign traditional courses by partnering with pedagogy and academic technology experts. The scale of this transformation is significant, 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 a suite of services 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. Indeed, we see a powerful iterative process for guiding the evolution of learning spaces on campus through which research guides new space design, and faculty development and further research feed into future iterations of classroom design and faculty support services.

The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee supports commitment to evidence-based course design, faculty development, and ongoing research into the impact of space and pedagogical innovation. Very consistently, in 07 and 09 and this year's faculty and undergraduate student technology surveys, students ranked "Instructors not using educational technologies well" as one of the top problems they face. In our 2007 survey, the last time we asked this question, students ranked using their tech fees to support faculty development among their top three priorities. When faculty were asked about priorities for spending university resources, they listed "providing support for faculty using educational technology" and "providing technology training for faculty" as two of the top answers. See <http://www.oit.umn.edu/research-evaluation/selected-research/technology-surveys/index.htm> for details.

We recommend that the administration provide robust financial support for faculty development in effective use of new learning spaces and their technology. We propose a tiered funding model that would include base funding as part of the cost pool, additional financial support from a percentage of student fees and special funding from a small percentage of new building construction costs (analogous to an existing commitment to fund public art projects by using a small percentage of the total cost of new building construction--more at <http://www.arts.state.mn.us/other/percent.htm>).

\* \* \*

## **STATEMENT ON FUNDING FOR CLASSROOM FACILITIES AND TECHNOLOGIES**

Students and instructors deserve classroom space that contains technology that is working and furnishings that are not broken and are in reasonably good and safe condition.

Classroom facilities and technologies require periodic maintenance and replacement, and identification of and planning for lifecycle costs is a fiscally prudent approach to management of classroom facilities and technology infrastructure. Deferred maintenance is expensive in the long run.

We note with great concern that classroom upgrade work continues to be funded primarily with one-time funds (e.g., capital projects like STSS). The recurring lifecycle costs for these classrooms have not been funded. We are, however, accruing these costs. Given the importance of general-purpose classrooms, we cannot continue to defer these costs without jeopardizing our teaching and learning mission.

Central classroom operational recurring funding levels had risen to 79% of requirements (FY08) then fell to 37% of lifecycle need with recurring cuts in FY09, 10, and 12. Concurrently, the amount of managed learning space grew with new buildings and the addition of student study space. Because of low funding levels and increased demand for resources, faculty and students will be required to use facilities and technologies that have outlived their planned lifespan. This will degrade the learning experience.

In addition to classroom responsibilities, OCM has been assigned the management and maintenance of over 29,000 square feet of student study space. These study spaces represent an additional \$2.4 million in OCM-managed assets. In January 2011, OCM received one-time funding for the update of multiple study spaces on the St. Paul campus but has not received funding for recurring maintenance and renewal requirements.

The following charts illustrate a problematic trend: that OCM's funding is decreasing while assigned space and tech equipped rooms is increasing.

Recurring Funding	% Change	
FY08	4,325,530	
FY09	4,221,824	-2.4%
FY10	3,063,551	-27.4%
FY11	3,048,664	-0.5%
FY12	2,648,013	-13.1%

Square Footage w/Study Space	% Change	
FY08	340,000	
FY09	355,800	4.6%
FY10	363,430	2.1%
FY11	374,714	3.1%
FY12	389,328	3.9%

The University of Minnesota invested in its learning spaces, but without recurring maintenance and renewal, at some point the technology, fixtures and furnishings will be inaccessible due to failure.

Given the budget reductions and future uncertainty, OCM has placed the following projects on hold:

Project	Cost	Notes
20 Tech. Lifecycle Renewals	\$350k	Deferred technology updates to 20 Projection Capable Classrooms
Vincent Hall 16, EB	\$250k	Remove fixed seating; ADA, Fire/Safety, carpet & finish upgrade
Borlaug 335 & 365, St. Paul	\$475k	Replace 230 seats (no longer made); carpet & finish upgrades
Ruttan Hall B25/35/45, St. Paul	\$700k	Replace 445 seats (no longer made); carpet & finish upgrades
Keller 3111/3115/3125/3230, EB	\$925k	Replace 315 seats (no longer made); carpet & finish upgrades
TOTAL	\$2.7M	

The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) supports the Office of Classroom Management and its planning for lifecycle maintenance and renewal. CAS recommends no further cuts to the classroom lifecycle funds to maintain the basic-level of maintenance and renewal of classroom infrastructure. CAS furthermore recommends restoring funding to the FY08 levels by the 2016-17 biennium, in order to provide a quality standard for classroom facilities, technology and support that is appropriate for a major, nationally ranked university.