

CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 16, 2002

[In these minutes: Welcome & Introductions, Overview of Committee's Charge, Reporting and Operating Structure, Committee Vacancies, Classroom Technology Upgrade Plan Status Update, Future Agenda Items]

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

PRESENT: Jane Phillips, chair, Steve Fitzgerald, Bernard Gulachek, Steve Spehn, Karen Alaniz, Kenneth Heller, James Perry, Steve Sperber, Nancy McGlynn

REGRETS: Bobbi Cordano, Denise Guerin, William Hanson, Nelson Rhodus

ABSENT: Jonathan Suk

I). Ms. Jane Phillips called the meeting to order, welcomed all present and asked that introductions be made.

II). Committee Business:

- Ms. Phillips provided members with an overview of the Committee's charge and reporting structure.
- While the full Committee will meet monthly, a majority of its work will be done behind the scenes by members willing to volunteer for particular projects/tasks.
- Ms. Phillips announced that the Committee has 3 student vacancies that need to be filled. Members were encouraged to forward names of individuals who might be interested in serving. Recommendations will be forwarded to the Student Committee on Committees.
- Jane Phillips will ask Gary Engstrand, Senate staff, to check on whether the chair of this committee needs to be a faculty member and report back to the Committee at its next meeting.

III). Steve Fitzgerald, Director, Office of Classroom Management, provided members with a status report on the Twin Cities General Purpose Classroom Technology Upgrade Plan. Highlights:

- Teaching and learning resources on campus include:
  - General-purpose or centrally scheduled classrooms. These classrooms are designed to meet the teaching and learning needs of a wide audience and are centrally managed, funded and scheduled. There are approximately

300 general-purpose classrooms in 63 buildings on the Twin Cities campus.

- There are 224 departmentally managed and funded classrooms.
  - There are 341 labs that are considered either collegiate or departmental resources.
- 
- The General-Purpose Classroom Technology Upgrade Plan is a comprehensive multiyear, phased-plan designed to establish a new ‘projection capable’ technology infrastructure baseline standard for all central classrooms. The plan includes wireless student connectivity in all Tech Upgrade rooms. It also includes additional modular add-on capabilities in selected rooms, such as the asynchronous “low-end” video streaming that is currently in testing. A key component of the plan is the identification of the lifecycle maintenance, equipment replacement and faculty support structure for technology-equipped classrooms.
  - Initial funding estimates for the plan were \$7 million one-time dollars for installations and \$1.5M recurring dollars for technology lifecycle costs. Updated projections indicate that recurring funds for technology are increasing slightly and one-time dollar estimates are falling.
  - Attributes of a projection capable classroom:
    - Basic technology infrastructure for teaching and learning
    - Data/video projection capability
    - Internet connectivity at instructor station
    - VCR or other input device
    - User-friendly laptop interface/control system
    - Other “add-on” modular capabilities
  - Executive Vice President & Provost, Bob Bruininks, initiated the ‘Leveraged Funding Initiative’. This initiative provided the Office of Classroom Management (OCM) with the necessary working capital enabling departments and colleges to partner with OCM to upgrade classrooms. The leveraged funding approach has been very successful. To illustrate, nine classrooms had been scheduled to be upgraded over the summer of 2002 and 27 were actually completed.
  - Two types of partnerships:
    - A department converts a departmental classroom to a central classroom. OCM installs the Tech Upgrade and assumes life cycle funding responsibility for the room.
    - OCM and the department cost-share the Tech Upgrade funding in a central room not scheduled to be upgraded for a year or more. The room is advanced to the head of the upgrade queue. Under both of the above scenarios, the partnering department is assigned “priority scheduling” in the classroom.

- The Office of Classroom Management and central administration are discussing the possibility of allocating more working capital towards the Leveraging Initiative in 2002 – 2003. The Office of Classroom Management continues to seek to partner with colleges and departments to maintain the plan’s current momentum and to upgrade classrooms. More information can be found at the OCM URL: [www.classroom.umn.edu](http://www.classroom.umn.edu)
- Despite the fact that the Technology Upgrade Plan is approximately two years behind its original schedule, great strides have been made.
- As of the start of fall semester 2002, 108 classrooms have had the Tech Upgrade completely installed and another 46 classrooms have some projection technology installed, but do not meet the U’s “projection-capable classroom” standard – TOTAL: 154
- The main problems faced by OCM are its inability to install the technology upgrades fast enough to meet the demand for these types of rooms and the lack of identifiable recurring funds for regular upgrades. The solution to this problem is to secure more funding.
- Administration has begun to fund recurring classroom technology lifecycle costs, but the required recurring funding still lags behind the full maintenance and replacement cost requirements. Fiscal year 2003 will be a critical year to continue to secure recurring funding for the plan.

In 2003, classroom recurring costs are \$1.7M for technology alone. Classroom operations have recurring funding of \$985,000. The difference is partially offset by one-time funding and having to divert Tech Upgrade funds to replace older technology equipment that is at the end of its life cycle.

OCM has conducted a comprehensive study on life cycle replacement costs in classrooms for areas other than technology e.g. furniture, fixtures etc. For the first time, these recurring life cycle costs are being identified and brought to central administration’s attention.

Mr. Fitzgerald expressed thanks to the Advisory Committee for its contribution to the Tech Upgrade effort, and particularly noted that the Committee played a key role in central administration’s allocation of the working capital that resulted in the successful leveraging initiative last summer.

IV). 2002 – 2003 action items being considered by CAS:

- Bring emerging technologies as well as state-of-the-art pedagogy requirements (e.g. class response system) to CAS so, when appropriate, the feasibility of incorporating such advancements into the University’s technology infrastructure can be discussed from the on-set.

- Review the Senate's 2000 'Classroom Expectations Guidelines' policy. Is this policy being enforced? Who receives this policy?  
(<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/classexpectguide.html>)
- Classroom utilization issues e.g. scheduling, etc.
- If a new stadium is built, will classrooms be part of that structure?
- Faculty development to include:
  - How can the use of classroom technology be incorporated in a faculty member's pedagogy?
  - Investment in technology enhanced curricular resources/materials that can be customized to a faculty member's pedagogy. Technology allows its users to do things better and more efficiently.
- Continue efforts to raise awareness and funding for the Classroom Technology Upgrade Plan. Besides capital funding issues there will always be other funding matters that have implications on classrooms e.g. funding for custodial services, etc.
- Better funding to make classrooms ADA accessible. Currently, only 27% of the University's classrooms are disability accessible.
- Custodial issues impacting classrooms.

It was agreed that the Subcommittee would not spend the entire year discussing technology upgrades because the classroom issue involves more than just technology.

Ms. Phillips and Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, will compile the list of possible agenda items discussed today and forward it to the parent committee, SCEP, for input and/or approval. Steve Fitzgerald, OCM Director, mentioned that classroom utilization issues should be discussed at the Subcommittee's next meeting on October 21, 2002. Once this issue has been addressed he suggested concurrently providing SCEP with both the list generated today and statistics and recommendations on classroom utilization issues.

V). Ms. Phillips asked members to read the report, From Classroom Space to Learning Space, written by Professor Ken Heller before the next meeting. This report was available at today's meeting and had been distributed earlier via e-mail to members.

With no further business, Ms. Phillips adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate