

**CAS**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**

March 31, 2014

[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: Kevin Smith (chair pro tem), Bradley Cohen, Mary Jetter, Roberta Kehne, Jeffrey Lindgren, Peggy McCarthy, Maria Sera, Kevin Smith, Susan Staats, Jeremy Todd

GUEST: Gary Cohen

REGRETS: Patricia Schaber (Chair), Christopher Isett, Daniel Orth, Connor Schaefer, Christine Swartwout

ABSENT: Thomas Wolfe

[In these minutes: Learning Space Master Plan (LSMP) principles Discussion; LSMP Issues from Finance and Planning Committee perspective.]

**WELCOME**

Professor Smith, chair pro tem, welcomed those present and called the meeting to order.

**LEARNING SPACE MASTER PLAN PRINCIPLES**

Professor Smith began the discussion by announcing and encouraging members to attend the Campus Conversation on Strategic Planning taking place on April 14, 2014 to discern the role of learning spaces in the strategic plan. Professor Smith posed the question: What is the process for developing a LSMP? How far would the committee articulate what would be in the plan?

- Mr. Cohen explained that Capital Planning would drive this. Mr. Todd explained that the 2009 plan was a collaborative effort with colleges, administration, and the libraries. There is a new paradigm for learning spaces. Look at how colleges work together and how the University can capitalize on this. How do we meet a spectrum of needs that may not exist now? Within strategic planning, what is the future of the learning spaces? Mr. Todd suggested that the strategic planning process be leveraged as a time for CAS to raise the issue of where learning space planning is involved, instead of this being a last step of a capital planning project.
- Mr. Cohen suggested that CAS create a concise statement for parent committee, but creation of the plan would be carried out by a task force consultant group that might line up with strategic planning.
- Ms. McCarthy suggested a higher-level shared standard be developed. It is often considered later in planning process, and a more cohesive vision for learning spaces would create a level of consistency.

- Mr. Cohen agreed that there is a need for level of consistency across learning spaces and emphasized the importance of place-based educational experience. He proposed that, based on previous discussions, they should develop themes and document what would be sought from a LSMP, for example, a comprehensive inventory and guiding principles for the spaces. Mr. Todd added that this is timed well with the strategic planning campus conversation and a draft can be developed before the next meeting and then discussed.

Members discussed the following priorities that should be expressed within a LSMP:

- Professor Smith said the previous plan focused on general purpose classrooms, the plan should include informal learning spaces, labs, etc.
- How to create a seamless learning environment; connect formal learning to study spaces, labs, and the urban community.
- Greater connections to align with system campuses, fluid boundaries, hybrid and service learning.
  - Mr. Cohen commented that a seamless connection to the urban environment conflicts with security pressures, but it can be a productive tension if we are planful and consider how to meet the needs of openness. Without a plan they are working at cross purposes.
- Service coordination within spaces.
- How does learning space and curriculum transformation address the grand challenges like poverty and access to education?
- Would there be a benefit to focusing on undergraduate vs. graduate spaces? There is a need to bring experiential learning to undergraduates. Mr. Cohen explained that there is a trend toward virtualization for graduate education, therefore consideration for spaces should have a very broad scope and include all levels of education.
- Beyond the controlled grounds, how can we better connect to the forestry system in the state?
- Mr. Cohen suggested that the process of developing STSS from a prototype to a large-scale implementation could be use as an example for rationale. The unplanned creation of the Science and student service corridor is another example that could be used to create other areas similarly and more quickly.
- Members discussed that a blended model of learning is superior to completely online or completely face-to-face. The land grant mission emphasizes the importance of place and the commitment to the state. Not just about students learning in a space together there are priorities specific the local communities, such as Hmong families.
- Strengthen active learning capacity and the value of collaboration in learning.

Professor Smith suggested that the proposed statement provide a rationale and suggested themes for the LSMP, a definition and high-level expectations. It should articulate a focus on learning outcomes within place-based education and diverse learning environments.

## **FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Professor Smith introduced guest Professor Gary Cohen, representative of the Finance and Planning (F & P) Committee. Professor Smith explained that the committee recognizes that the Strategic Planning Process is occurring and would like learning spaces to be included in context of this broader planning. He then asked how F&P would respond to a recommendation.

- Professor Cohen explained that F & P has had only few reports of the Strategic Planning process. The most recent update was delivered by Professor Will Durfee, chair, FCC, and he made clear that at this stage, the planning consists of grand visions, goal statements, but not yet much about implementation.
- Priorities that have budgetary implications have not been set. Presume there will be campus wide discussion. As a faculty member, space planning needs attention all the time, continually fine-tuning and finding ways, in regard to classrooms, how the spaces are being used. What are the needs given current and future pedagogical needs? Classrooms are often treated as another service function and when there are budget cuts, classrooms are not advocated for. As teaching technologies are developed, demands are increased. He stressed the importance of meeting the needs of a wide spectrum of users and plugging in to the budget process at the right time will create a better chance for the needs to be heard.
- He sees it appropriate for F&P to hear about issues with a budgetary implication, such as those prescribed by a LSMP. He offered the committee the opportunity to discuss this issue with F & P in the future as the recommendations are developed. He emphasized the need for the committee to support the initiatives of the Office for Classroom Management.

Professor Smith outlined the work to be completed before the next meeting:

- Outline and articulate a need for a LSMP.
- Start blank document that the committee can edit together.
- Draft a paragraph that summarizes the history, implementation, and results of STSS.

Hearing no further business, Professor Smith adjourned the meeting.

Jeannine Rich  
University Senate Office