

CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
MARCH 3, 2008

[In these minutes: Science Teaching and Student Services (STSS) Building Discussion, Card Access Systems, 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: Ken Heller, chair, Jeffrey Hammer, Caroline Rosen, Jeremy Todd for Steve Fitzgerald, Jeffrey Lindgren, Thomas Michaels, Larren Collins, James Hambleton, Eric Otremba

REGRETS: Roberta Juarez

ABSENT: Michael Berthelsen, Bernard Gulachek, Jay Hatch, Kay Wahl, Tina Louise Tyler

OTHERS ATTENDING: Mike Garza

I). Professor Heller called the meeting to order.

II). Professor Heller introduced the first agenda item, a schematic plan review of the Science Teaching and Student Services (STSS) building. Member's feedback about the space was solicited.

Jeremy Todd from the Office of Classroom Management, using a PowerPoint presentation, provided members with location details, and the plans for the building. He noted that the primary objectives of STSS is to:

1. Promote an innovative, flexible science teaching and learning environment, which will support technology-rich and hands-on, interactive instruction.
2. Provide a consolidated student services center for front-line academic and transactional services that cannot be effectively handled on-line, such as academic counseling and career counseling.

Mr. Todd highlighted other noteworthy aspects of this building:

- This project will be the University's first attempt to achieve LEED Gold Certification.
- The larger STSS classrooms have been designed to be flexed.
- Total gross square footage for the entire building will be 115,000.
- Classrooms will make up approximately 35,000 assignable square feet in STSS, Student Services will make up roughly 26,000 assignable square feet, classroom

support 1,350 assignable square feet and public circulation/study space approximately 3,000 assignable square feet.

- The target budget for this project is \$72,500,000. Construction costs are projected to run \$51,750,000 and non-construction (also known as 'soft costs') are expected to run \$20,750,000. The University's capital request for this building was \$48.3 million, which the Board of Regents has approved, and the University will fund the remaining \$24.2 million.
- STSS will be a signature building for the University.

The committee spent a significant amount of time reviewing the schematic plans for the building.

Member's feedback regarding STSS:

- It seems odd that given STSS is being built in a more sustainable fashion that its operating costs are not expected to be go down.
- A shortfall for this building is the insufficient amount of classroom support space.
- The building's design focuses on a narrow set of uses rather than a broad set of uses.
- Given the classrooms in STSS are general-purpose classrooms; a greater amount of space should be allocated to classroom support space. Single-purpose classrooms need less classroom support space than general-purpose classrooms.
- A concern regarding traffic flow management during class change time intervals was voiced in light of the layout of the building. Assuming all the classrooms are in use, the building needs to be designed to efficiently get students in and out of the building in a very short amount of time. Heavy use buildings are generally not good in terms of handling student flow, e.g. Physics Building.
- Comments from the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) and other relevant committees should be sought early on in the process rather than later.
- When it comes to designing classrooms, it should not be assumed that technology replaces 'show and tell.'

III). Mr. Todd provided the committee with a brief overview concerning the use of card access systems across campus. In the winter of 2005 – 2006, an examination of card access systems for both interior spaces (classrooms) and exterior spaces was conducted. Nicholson Hall was the first building with central classroom card access. This building opened for classes in January 2006. Since that time, card access systems have been added to other locations across campus for accessibility purposes and to ensure buildings are open and available when they are scheduled to be open.

In 2006, OCM submitted a request, which was approved by the Central Security Infrastructure Improvement Program. Under this request, 10 additional building entrances were outfitted with card access systems.

Mr. Todd cited some advantages for using card access systems, e.g. allows Central Security to program doors to be unlocked for a specified period, which is particularly helpful when rooms need to be opened after hours.

Is there a plan to switch the campus over to card access in some systematic way asked Professor Heller? Mr. Todd stated that the plan is install this technology in new buildings and renovated buildings. Also, as individual classrooms are renovated for accessibility purposes, card access systems will likely be added as well.

A member asked what is being done to eliminate the inconveniences associated with using a card access system in the event of a power outage. Mr. Todd stated that in addition to installing a generator, adding a UPS (Uninterruptible Power Supply) to a building would serve to address this type of concern. He added that for a majority of classrooms, battery-operated systems are being looked at.

Mr. Todd noted that the UCard Office is exploring new UCards with dual technology. While UCards will retain their magnetic strip, they will also have a chip in the card so it can be used as a smart card. A pilot project for a new UCard will be launched this fall.

IV). Mr. Todd provided the committee with preliminary feedback about the active learning classrooms on campus. To introduce this agenda item, a short video was shown.

Preliminary feedback indicates that students really like to use of the marker boards as a way to share their ideas. This feedback was received from both students and faculty. Mr. Todd stated that in his opinion there are multiple benefits to the active learning classrooms. These classrooms allow for much more interaction than a majority of general-purpose classrooms currently in inventory.

V). Professor Heller noted that the primary agenda item for the April 7th meeting would be student study space. In addition, at an upcoming meeting the committee will discuss the need for a policy to ensure that the University builds an adequate amount of classroom space. Currently, there is a lack of adequate classroom space for some courses, and, in addition, in situations when buildings are taken off-line.

Hearing no further business, Professor Heller adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate