

SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTFOLIO MEETING

DATE: October 21, 2015

TIME: 1-2:30 p.m.

LOCATION: Marriott Library, Room 5201

IN ATTENDANCE:

Rick Ash	Kirsten Butcher	Patrick Panos	Fernando Rubio
Wayne Samuelson	Catherine Soehner	Jon Thomas	Patrick Tripeny

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Paul Burrows, Scott Sherman

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

Martha Bradley	Anthony Fratto	Stephen Hess	Linda Ralston
Jean Shipman			

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Nancy Lombardo, Eccles Health Sciences Library
Stan Clements, UOnline, Teaching & Learning Technologies
Erik Hjorten, Associate Director, Teaching & Learning Technologies

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

- Proposal for branching out proctored exam services beyond online students
- Review of clicker policy
- Learning Spaces funding timeline
- Deciding how to bring a new classroom on refurbishment cycle

Proposal for branching out proctored exam services beyond online students

Stan Clements, manager of the UOnline exam center, briefed the committee on how UOnline proctored exams operate. The center is funded by a fee paid as part of online course tuition. In addition to the main testing center in the Marriott Library, there are also sites in Sandy and St. George. The main campus location is a 110-seat lab dedicated to proctoring online student exams, with the majority being midterms or finals. However, there is plenty of capacity throughout the semester to accommodate more students, and some faculty have inquired about using the center for in-person or hybrid class exams. Students would have the option of taking those exams at additional times, as well, because they would not necessarily be bound to take them during class time.

The Business School had shown interest in creating its own proctored testing facility, but after discussions with UOnline there was a desire to explore a trial period to allow Business faculty to use the existing facility. The pilot would evaluate how adding face-to-face or hybrid class students affects the overall usage of the facility, gather the impressions of the students and faculty using it, and what additional costs or benefits the University might see at scale. Committee members said any cost associated with the proctored testing for face-to-face or hybrid students should be covered by the department and not by the students. The committee agreed to approve a six-month pilot.

Review of clicker policy

During a review of Teaching & Learning Technologies website content, a 2011 policy regarding clickers was found to still be in effect. The policy covers which brand of clickers are sold at the University Bookstore. The committee was asked whether the policy should be updated or retired. Members suggested that clicker technology had changed so drastically since 2011 that a policy might not be necessary, but that any update should involve the Academic Senate. The group agreed that John Francis and Steve Hess, who were involved in the original policy, and the Academic Senate should be consulted before any action is taken.

Learning Spaces funding timeline

Last year, the Learning Spaces funding process took eight months from beginning to end. There was desire expressed by many applicants to speed up that process to be more in line with the typical budgeting cycle. There were several more recommendations that came out of last year's process in regards to defining the scope of requests.

Additionally, the committee was informed that the available funds will be reduced this year. The Student Computing Fees that fund the Learning Spaces allocations are paid as part of students' tuition, but students who receive tuition waivers — most often graduate students — do not pay fees. In the past, the University had used earnings from interest on other accounts to provide funding equal to what those students would have paid if they not had a tuition waiver. That equaled about \$350,000 a year for the Learning Spaces fund. The University indicated in July 2015, after the 2015 Learning Spaces funding already had been approved and allocated by the portfolio, that it would no longer provide funding to cover that gap, retroactive to the already disbursed 2015 funds. Therefore, this coming year's total allocation will be reduced by the \$350,000 for both 2015 and 2016, and then by \$350,000 in 2017 and beyond barring any other change.

The portfolio asked that a representative from University Information Technology, which receives the computing fees and manages their disbursement on behalf of the University, speak with the group about the change at its next meeting.

Deciding how to bring a new classroom on refurbishment cycle

The group quickly discussed how to bring classrooms into the general classroom refurbishment cycle. The committee will have to discuss specifically how to address the Health Sciences Education Building, as it is a general use building scheduled differently from other general use areas on campus. It was agreed there will be more discussion about this at a future meeting.

Action summary			
Action	Topic	Person/Group	Next step
Approved	Proposal for branching out proctored exam services beyond online students	Portfolio	A six-month pilot program to open the UOnline testing center to traditional and hybrid students.
Action Item	Review of clicker policy	Portfolio	Additional information will be sought before broaching any change in clicker policy.
Action item	Learning Spaces funding timeline	Jon Thomas	Steve Hess or Lisa Kuhn will be asked to speak about the reduction in funding at a future meeting.
Delayed	Deciding how to bring a new classroom on refurbishment cycle	Portfolio	This topic will return at a future meeting.