

SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTFOLIO MEETING

DATE: October 22, 2014

TIME: 12:30-1:30 p.m.

LOCATION: Marriott Library, Room 5201

IN ATTENDANCE:

Rick Ash	Martha Bradley	Kirsten Butcher	Steve Corbató
Jesus Hernandez	Nalini Nadkarni	Linda Ralston	Fernando Rubio
Wayne Samuelson	Jean Shipman	Catherine Soehner	Jon Thomas
Patrick Tripeny			

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Qin Li, Rene Eborn

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

Pam Hardin Patrick Panos

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Peter Panos, Finance, University Information Technology

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

- Teaching and Learning funds allocation

Teaching and Learning funds allocation

Jon Thomas took the group through a projected allocation of student computing fees based on historical information and current projects the portfolio has agreed to fund. Some decisions must be made to bring the budget in line with funding. Thomas reviewed the cost to refurbish classrooms with newer technology and proposed a five-year replacement cycle. Members asked whether there was any other source of money devoted to classroom technology, and whether reducing computer lab upgrades could help fund more classroom technology upgrades. There is no other money directed to classroom technology, Thomas said. Members discussed some potential problems with reducing computer labs, and suggested ensuring a standard definition of a “computer lab” vs. a “computer classroom.” In a “computer classroom,” the instructor teaches students using software or hardware that requires a minimum performance threshold that students’ machines may not meet (such as multimedia production). These could not be scaled back without negatively affecting instruction.

Discussion shifted to the maintenance portion of the allocations for requested projects, which stands at 45 percent of the initial total disbursed evenly over three years. Thomas presented an option whereby the maintenance funds would be centrally pooled and project recipients would request either funds or reimbursement for maintenance issues related to the request. That would provide for a better accounting of how much maintenance is required and perhaps allow for additional projects to be funded in the future. Members said those funds may be used in ways other than maintenance of the initial project, but questioned whether it was wise to change that model. One member said the panel

agreed to adjust that model a year ago. It was pointed out that the purpose of the computing fees is to ensure students have the best learning environment possible, and the group should evaluate changes to the existing process in that light.

The group acknowledged that no matter what changes are ultimately adopted, someone will see a negative consequence, but the portfolio has to consider the best use of the funds for students.

A motion was made to adopt a six-year refurbishment schedule for all classrooms. All but one member voted in favor.

The group will await further information from Peter Panos before determining whether to adjust the maintenance-fund distributions.

Action summary			
Action	Topic	Person/Group	Next step
Vote	Teaching and Learning funds allocation	Portfolio	The portfolio adopted a six-year room-refurbishment cycle.
Action item	Teaching and Learning funds allocation	Peter Panos	The UIT Finance department will provide information about how maintenance funds are being utilized.