

SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTFOLIO MEETING

DATE: April 29, 2015

TIME: 1-3 p.m.

LOCATION: Marriott Library, Administrative Boardroom

IN ATTENDANCE:

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Rick Ash | Martha Bradley | Kirsten Butcher | Jordan Gerton |
| Patrick Panos | Linda Ralston | Jean Shipman | Catherine Soehner |
| Jon Thomas | Patrick Tripeny | | |

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Qin Li, Scott Sherman

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

| | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Steve Corbató | Pam Hardin | Stephen Hess | Anthony Oyler |
| Fernando Rubio | Wayne Samuelson | | |

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Paul Burrows, Information Architect, Teaching & Learning Technologies
Mike Ekstrom, Director, Common Infrastructure Services
Matt Irsik, Head of Student Computing, Marriott Library
Lisa Kuhn, Chief Financial Officer, University Information Technology
Brett Puzey, Installation Manager, Teaching & Learning Technologies
Cassandra Van Buren, Associate Director, Office of the CIO

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

- Briefing from Student Computing Fee Learning Spaces Task Force

Briefing from Student Computing Fee Learning Spaces Task Force

Lisa Kuhn began by showing the overall amount of Student Computing Fees for the fiscal year, projected to be about \$6.5 million, but summer term tuition has not yet been paid and it could come in lower than planned. Historically, the amount of money allocated to departments and colleges through the SCAC and portfolio governance process has been constant, at \$3.48 million for colleges and departments and \$203,000 for eClassroom projects. This year, \$2.93 million is earmarked for colleges and departments because the portfolio last year chose to allocate an additional \$297,000 to eClassroom refurbishments and another \$250,000 to the campuswide Adobe agreement. UIT has also historically received \$2.6 million of the Student Computing Fees to support the student portions of central services, including administrative applications, Umail, the campus help desk, network edge services for classroom buildings, wired and wireless network infrastructure, and information security. The remainder of the funds covers some additional central licensing for things like Canvas and Box. This general allocation has not changed for many years, and UIT has generally absorbed any shortfalls in funding and passed on any extra funds to the SCAC or portfolio committee to allocate.

The portfolio members each have been given a packet of proposals that includes the executive summaries as written by the Learning Spaces Task Force, a group appointed to meet with each requester to ensure the accuracy of proposals and to get the answers to any questions that the portfolio may have. The members of the task force — Catherine Soehner, Paul Burrows, Matt Irsik, Cassandra Van Buren, Brett Puzey, Trevor Long/Mike Ekstrom, and Scott Sherman — met with representatives from each requesting area for about 45 minutes apiece, and each spent about 40 hours reviewing material, conducting interviews and summarizing the findings.

Paul Burrows reviewed the spreadsheet and Equella database containing all the proposal information, as well as some of the key issues that bubbled up from the data and interviews. For instance, in the past about \$50,000 was set aside for audiovisual technology in department-controlled classrooms, yet this year's requests were seeking \$550,000. Overall, departments and colleges were requesting more than \$800,000 beyond the available funds. The Task Force meetings also brought to light some improvements to be made in the notification process, followup communication, definitions, transparency, and advocacy. The representatives told the Task Force they appreciated the opportunity to meet with them and hoped to see continued improvement to the process.

Jon Thomas presented some options for the group to consider as it was making cuts to meet budget. The first option would be to fund fewer classrooms than were requested. He noted the large gap between past funding and current requests, but noted that for many requests the classroom upgrades were listed as the top priority and should be considered carefully. He said there were some projects that requesters said could be cut, and removing those would shave \$200,000 off the deficit. Another option would be to consider funding some requests in part, perhaps choosing criteria for full and partial funding and applying it evenly.

It was suggested that technology funding needs to become a much more important process when new buildings are approved. Building managers need to plan for building technology as part of the fundraising efforts rather than try to obtain funding in the final stages of completion.

Another option the committee could consider would be to fund infrastructure requests differently, such that centralized resources were funded at 100 percent and external solutions at 75 percent. That would be problematic in cases where centralized services were not adequate to the need or there was not a centralized offering. Finally, there was the option of basing requests off the historical average.

Members talked about the advantages and disadvantages of each approach. One committee member said it would be helpful to have more information about how these projects will really benefit the student body. Some requesters provided information about lab logins or usage, while others did not. Perhaps that should be a requirement in the future, though ample time would need to be given so administrators could get the right tools in place to measure student impact. Though it was noted the

portfolio does not want to punish less populous colleges just because they are smaller; it would simply help gauge the net effect of the allocations.

In the end, it was determined that moving away from the historical averages to a purely merit-based approach this year would not be appropriate, but with some funds being tied to the Adobe agreement and other general-use classroom upgrades — as well as the addition of the College of Dentistry and the Entertainment Arts and Engineering program to the pool of requests — there would be less money available for each area. The group decided to look how much of the current requests could be funded for each area based on their historical allocations to see whether that would help guide the decision-making, and then adjust the funding based on the merits of “bubble” projects.

| Action summary | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|--|
| Action | Topic | Person/Group | Next step |
| Discussed | Student Computing Fee project proposals | Portfolio | The group will continue discussion at future meetings. |

SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTFOLIO MEETING

DATE: April 30, 2015

TIME: 9-11 a.m.

LOCATION: Marriott Library, Administrative Boardroom

IN ATTENDANCE:

| | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Rick Ash | Martha Bradley | Kirsten Butcher | Steve Corbató |
| Jordan Gerton | Patrick Panos | Linda Ralston | Melissa Rethlefsen |
| Catherine Soehner | Jon Thomas | Patrick Tripeny | |

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Qin Li, Scott Sherman

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Pam Hardin | Stephen Hess | Anthony Oyler | Fernando Rubio |
| Wayne Samuelson | Jean Shipman | | |

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Paul Burrows, Information Architect, Teaching & Learning Technologies
Matt Irsik, Head of Student Computing, Marriott Library

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

- Discuss Student Computing Fee project proposals

Discuss Student Computing Fee project proposals

Jon Thomas reviewed with the group a spreadsheet showing the average allocations for each requester over the past four years, which have been fairly consistent and therefore provide a good yardstick against which to measure. Many of the requests total more than 20 percent above the previous average allocations, and four are more than 150 percent above past years' outlays. The question arose as to the replacement cycle requesters are using for desktop machines. Typically the replacement cycles are three to five years depending on how heavily the machines are used or whether they require updated specifications to run specialized hardware or software. The replacement cycles were noted in the executive summaries provided by the Learning Spaces Task Force.

The group began looking at maintenance requests first, noting that many of the requests made an effort to cut the maintenance pool while others did not or even increased their request. One suggestion was to start by awarding the maintenance for those that made an appreciable effort to cut that funding or who made a strong justification for the number they were seeking. For those that did not reduce their ask or who increased it beyond prior years, they might get 50 percent of the average for the past four years simply because they were unwilling to make a decision to reduce it or to provide ample justification for how the money is being spent on maintenance. The group noted — as did many requesters in the Task Force meetings — that there could be a clearer definition of what constitutes maintenance so that proposals are more or less in line with one another in that regard. Software

licensing and printing supplies in particular were inconsistent across proposals, with some being sought as line-item requests and others part of maintenance. The portfolio members were impressed with some requests that sought more maintenance than might be expected but backed it up with detailed information about service contracts to maintain machines or devices.

One member wondered whether it would be feasible to ask for a request forecast in the future, allowing departments and colleges to telegraph large requests a year or two in advance so that the portfolio can better account for the ebbs and flows of the big-ticket items.

| Action summary | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|--|
| Action | Topic | Person/Group | Next step |
| Discussed | Discuss Student Computing Fee project proposals | Portfolio | The group will continue discussion at future meetings. |