

CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
May 4, 2009

[In these minutes: Classroom Performance Index (CPI), Classroom Updates, Continued Discussion on Planning for the Use of Person-Based Computing Devices on Campus]

[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: Thomas Michaels, chair, Jeffrey Hammer, Steve Fitzgerald, Scott Barnard for Linda Jorn, Priscilla Cushman, Keya Ganguly, William Gleason

REGRETS: Roberta Juarez, Jay Hatch, Jean King, Kelsey Eide, Kathrin Hahn, James Hambleton

ABSENT: Michael Hannon, Michael Berthelsen, Jeffrey Lindgren

GUESTS: Anya Norton, Office of Classroom Mangement;

OTHERS ATTENDING: Mike Garza

I). Professor Michaels called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present.

II). Professor Michaels turned to Steve Fitzgerald, director, Office of Classroom Management, to introduce the first agenda item, a report on the Classroom Performance Index (CPI). Mr. Fitzgerald introduced Anya Norton, an OCM Planning and Projects reports analyst, who would be providing the CPI report.

Ms. Norton used a PowerPoint presentation to supplement her presentation. She began by noting that the CPI is a tool for measuring and documenting classroom condition, performance and needs. The CPI is made up of four broad categories with 23 criteria. Each of the criteria is weighed, and used to produce a relative ranking of classroom performance. The four broad categories include:

1. Condition Measurement
2. Design Measurement
3. Performance Measurement
4. Satisfaction

Ms. Norton then provided examples of the criteria that fell into each category. She noted that using these 23 criteria allows OCM to get a clear picture of how each classroom is performing.

In reference to Ms. Norton's comments concerning Appendix DD, Professor Michaels stated that he doubts that very many members of the University community are aware of

Appendix DD, which outlines the requirements for University classrooms. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that this information is on the OCM website (<http://www.classroom.umn.edu/facilities/>). He suggested as a future agenda item reviewing these standards with the committee.

Ms. Norton highlighted possible users of the CPI data:

- Staff who operate, maintain, and plan central classrooms.
- Academic building capital planners and budget officials.
- Everyone who supports faculty teaching and student learning in classrooms.

Next, the benefits of the CPI were shared with the committee:

- Provides an easy to understand indicator of classroom resource needs.
- Valuable decision aid that augments other systems and information both internal to OCM and externally.
- Useful in capital planning and resource allocation for academic buildings containing classrooms.
- Beneficial as an adjunct to Facilities Management's (FM) Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA) tool.
- Helpful in project justification to the legislature.

CPI challenges include:

- Breadth and scope of metrics.
- How to register voice of faculty and students.
- Simplifying the overwhelming amount of data housed in multiple databases into a summary metric.
- Limited resources for compiling the information.

CPI results include:

- Successfully quantified the broad range of detailed metrics into a correlated single summary measure.
- Results assist the University in resource allocation for renovation, construction, and upgrade projects.
- Use of student and faculty evaluations for each classroom.
- Facilitates a simplified approach to getting at this data.

Next steps include:

- Introducing the CPI to the capital planning process.
- Integrating multiple databases into one relational database.
- Improving the model and refine components.
- Incorporating classroom utilization data in order to get a better understanding of the impact classroom utilization has on classroom condition.

Ms. Norton then spent time demonstrating the CPI for the committee.

In response to a question, Ms. Norton explained that not all classroom criteria are weighted equally. While all classroom criteria are important, some criteria are not as important as the lifecycle component and the FCA component. Mr. Fitzgerald added that the absolute ranking of a classroom is not as important as the relevant values of the different categories. For example, great strides have been made in terms of accessibility, furniture and technology in classrooms, but fewer numbers of classrooms meet the lighting and acoustic standards, which happens to be among the most expensive to upgrade.

How are classroom acoustics measured asked a member? Acoustics, noted Ms. Norton, are measured based on the standards set forth in Appendix DD (<http://www.cppm.umn.edu/standards/AppendixDD.pdf>). Every classroom is tested on average once every 3 years by an outside organization. Mr. Fitzgerald added that the University has received positive feedback nationally on the institution's acoustic standards.

A member asked whether the CPI data can be used in a rationale way for building renovation purposes. This data would be very valuable to share with legislators. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that this is exactly what this data should be used for. It is difficult to get classroom renovation projects funded through the system. There are plans to use the CPI data to get justification for classroom/building renovation projects.

Would it be possible to use the CPI to analyze non-central classrooms asked a member? It would be difficult noted Mr. Fitzgerald. The criteria that the CPI uses is applicable to central classrooms, but not applicable elsewhere unless specified by a cognizant official. The regime that measures data, conducts the inspections, and does the reporting are specific to central classrooms. Classrooms that are not in the OCM inventory are not inspected, measured, and quantified in the same manner.

Are there smart boards in central classrooms asked a member? Ms. Norton stated that there are no smart boards in central classrooms. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the problem with smart boards is that they are only about 6 feet maximum. Therefore, in all but the smallest of University seminar rooms, this technology is too small. OCM thinks it can get the same functionality by using tablet PCs. OCM continues to analyze smart board technology on an on-going basis, but, to date, no smart white board system scales into the University's larger classrooms.

A member asked what drives prioritization of classroom renovation projects. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that classroom renovation is driven by lifecycle, need, and, hopefully, CPI data. Other drivers include consultation, requirements, etc. Clearly, most projects are resource driven. The University has not succeeded in getting systemwide classroom improvement projects through the funding system and approved by the legislature; the last time one of these projects was approved was in 2003 (Blegen Hall). For the most part, systemwide classroom projects are funded by Higher Education Asset Preservation and Replacement (HEAPR) and the needs for HEAPR funds at the University are overwhelming, e.g., fire/life safety, roofs. In response, a committee member stated that

classroom renovations should not compete for HEAPR funding, but should rather stand on their own merits when funding is requested from the legislature.

A member asked whether any of the rumors about the University closing buildings to save money are true. Michael Garza stated that the only building closures he has heard about are Music Education, Norris Gym, Peik Gym, and the Eddy Hall Annex.

In response to a question about clustering classrooms during the weekends to limit the number of buildings that need to be opened Mr. Fitzgerald stated that this is being discussed given the budget challenges facing the University.

Professor Michaels and members of the committee thanked Ms. Norton for her presentation.

III). Mr. Fitzgerald provided the committee with a couple brief classroom updates:

- Twenty-two classrooms and 1,892 student seats will be unavailable for scheduling as of fall semester 2009 with the Science Classroom Building, 1701 University, Peik Gym, and Norris Gym being taken off-line. By using departmental classrooms, eliminating non-standard courses, abiding by the 60/40 rule, and reducing classroom seat over projections has served to improve upon classroom utilization. Currently, there are about 70 unplaced courses for fall semester 2009, which is down dramatically from previous years at this same time.

Also, with the elimination of a significant number of non-standard courses, OCM has been able to open up more scheduling opportunities. For example, a pilot project for fall semester 2009 and spring semester 2010 has allowed OCM to schedule additional B time scheme courses (75 minute courses that meet twice per week) on Mondays/Wednesdays and Wednesdays/Fridays. OCM intends to come back to the governance system next fall and likely recommend that these pilot changes be institutionalized.

- Several classroom projects will take place this summer. This past year 23 technology upgrades were installed, which means that 92% of all classrooms meet the technology standard. Future projects will be driven by funding; there are a number of projects currently on hold awaiting funding. OCM has taken a \$250,000 un-allotment for FY09.

A member asked whether there are plans to put classrooms in Northrop Auditorium. Yes, stated Mr. Fitzgerald, approximately 10 – 12 classrooms will be put into Northrop Auditorium.

Professor Michaels asked whether the TCF Bank Stadium will have any classrooms. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that while there is some space available in the stadium, unfortunately, it is located in the back of the stadium, and this is not particularly conducive when student transit time is factored into using this space for classrooms. This space remains a possibility for classrooms in the future.

IV). Next, Professor Michaels turned members' attention to a draft document he crafted that attempts to synthesize the committee's on-going discussions concerning planning for the use of person-based computing devices. He asked members for their thoughts on the best way for communicating to the broader University community what the committee has learned about new technologies and their potential impact on learning spaces and learning strategies.

The committee spent time discussing the importance of having a logical plan for the use of person-based computing devices on campus. Such a plan it was noted will serve to leverage rather than fractionalize the campus.

Members endorsed the document drafted by Professor Michaels and agreed that, once finalized, it should be forwarded as an advisory memo to the committee's parent committee as well as President Bruininks, Provost Sullivan, Dr. Frank Cerra, and the Deans.

Professor Michaels agreed to revise the document in order to capture the essence of today's discussion, and send it out for comment from members. Mr. Fitzgerald added that the committee may want to consider collaborating on this issue with the Senate Committee on Information Technology (SCIT). Professor Michaels concurred that it would be important to bring issues related to teaching and learning and information technology in classrooms together.

V). Professor Michaels reminded members that today's meeting is the last meeting of the 2008 – 2009 academic year. He thanked members for their participation. Mr. Fitzgerald also thanked the committee on behalf of OCM.

Hearing no further business, Professor Michaels adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate