

**SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTFOLIO MEETING**

**DATE: May 20-21, 2015**

**TIME: 1-4 p.m. & 9 a.m.-12 p.m.**

**LOCATION: Marriott Library, Room 5201**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Rick Ash	Martha Bradley	Kirsten Butcher	Steve Corbató
Jordan Gerton	Jesus Hernandez	Linda Ralston	Wayne Samuelson
Jean Shipman	Catherine Soehner	Jon Thomas	Patrick Tripeny

**COMMITTEE SUPPORT:** Paul Burrows, Scott Sherman

**UNABLE TO ATTEND:**

Pam Hardin	Stephen Hess	Anthony Oyler	Patrick Panos
Fernando Rubio	Patrick Tripeny		

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Cassandra Van Buren, Office of the CIO, University Information Technology  
Matt Irsik, Marriott Library  
Mike Ekstrom, Common Infrastructure Services, University Information Technology  
Brett Puzey, Teaching & Learning Technologies

**AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:**

- Continuation of Student Computing Fee proposal evaluation

**Continuation of Student Computing Fee proposal evaluation**

It was noted there was a significant amount of money being requested for classroom audiovisual equipment, which is not traditionally what the bulk of the Student Computing Fees were meant to fund. Members suggested being reserved in those allocations to allow for funding of more projects for which the funds have traditionally purchased. One member suggested a campuswide mobile digital management solution would be worth exploring, as the current climate is moving away from desktop machines and more toward mobile.

While evaluating proposals, members reviewed some requests that seemed to be more at home in the maintenance category and moved them over to that area and funded them. Higher-expense items of lower priority were also considered. In some cases, partial funding was provided for some lab machine replacements. In regards to Marriott Library student-focused staff funds (mainly help desk) that have been covered in the past several years, the committee voted to approve them this year but urged Marriott to find alternative funding in following years.

Regarding Humanities, the group cut a request for new computers in OSH because the building is scheduled for demolition and the group felt new machines might not be the best use of funds at this

time. It did, however, consider a state-of-the-art classroom lab being built in LNCO to be a worthwhile project and chose to fund it despite earlier reservations about funding too much classroom technology.

The group talked about the difficulty in determining whether to fund highly specialized labs that only serve a small number of students, or whether to partially fund them. The group chose to partially fund some of those requests, but made a note to revisit the issue for clarification in the future. In another case, a significant request for funding half of a storage server was partially funded. The committee wanted to see an actual quote for the hardware before committing more funds, and the current request appeared to be a ballpark estimate.

In other cases, the members weighed how much of the equipment requested was truly student use and how much supported department use. In cases where the requestor did not indicate a reasonable student/department/research split on the spreadsheet, the group did its best to gauge what a reasonable percentage of student use might be. This was a similar issue in regards to Continuing Education, which serves both credit and non-credit students as well as offers for-profit classes. The portfolio members did their best to use the data available to determine a fair percentage of funding to come from Student Computing Fees.

In the end, the committee reached its goal of funding about \$2.9 million of project and maintenance requests, and several questions were noted for future discussion. Award notifications will go out to recipients with more detail and data than in previous years, just as requestors asked for during the Learning Spaces Task Force meetings. Additional discussions will be had as necessary.

Action summary			
Action	Topic	Person/Group	Next step
Approved	Student Computing Fee allocations	Portfolio	The allocation reports will be written and disseminated to all recipients. Several issues that were noted by the Portfolio will be addressed in future meetings.