

SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTFOLIO

DATE: July 7, 2016

TIME: 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

LOCATION: Marriott Library, MLIB 5201

IN ATTENDANCE:

Rick Ash	Martha Bradley	Kirsten Butcher	Patrick Panos
Wayne Samuelson	Catherine Soehner	Ryan Steele	Cory Stokes
Jon Thomas	Patrick Tripeny		

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Paul Burrows, Emily Rushton

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

Jesus Hernandez	Nancy Lombardo	Anthony Oyler	Linda Ralston
Fernando Rubio			

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

- Learning Spaces final outcomes
- Forced rank activity for issues going forward
- Review of exam services F2F pilot
- Review of forced rank activity
- Progress on survey for Learning Spaces: Student Needs and Perspective

Learning Spaces final outcomes

Paul Burrows showed the group the final numbers of awarded funds for Learning Spaces, and reviewed the Milton Bennion Hall (MBH) equipment-repurposing project. Thanks to a few colleges and departments taking advantage of the repurposed equipment from MBH, the amount of awarded funds dropped and created a surplus of \$8,673, which will be rolled into next year's Learning Spaces funding. This year's Learning Spaces funding awards are soon to be dispersed after much work and collaboration with Accounting.

Burrows presented a document of all comments collected from applicants and the task force during this year's Learning Spaces/student computing fees process, and reminded the group that they could all access this document for further review.

Forced rank activity for issues going forward

Jon Thomas said he and Cory Stokes would like to work on creating a flexible roadmap of what should be done over the next year. He asked the group to complete an activity ranking the top five action items most important to each member (items each member felt should be addressed in the coming months). The group took 5-10 minutes to complete this activity.

Review of exam services F2F pilot

Stan Clements presented on potentially extending services that the UOnline Center provides to face-to-face courses (currently, UOnline focuses primarily on online course support). Clements gave a quick review of the services UOnline provides and where the UOnline testing center is located in the Marriott library. Clements reviewed the many perceived benefits to extending the service, including: the expertise of the UOnline team in regards to administering exams; returning construction time back to the classroom; more manageable and easier grading; a convenient location to both study and take exams in the library; flexibility of allowing students to schedule exams when it works for them; reduces large crowds and lines; and provides a one-stop-shop for students and faculty.

Clements clarified that this option, thus far, has not been available to any courses (with one special condition exception for a chemistry course). They have just recently been testing the face-to-face option with seven courses. He showed a graph of what a typical semester looks like for the UOnline testing center, and said they would like to get more data because as of now, they've only had a very small sample to pull data from (a total of 182 exams for face-to-face courses).

The committee considered a number of variables, including: capacity limits of the testing center; scalability; priority of online students vs. face-to-face; funding options; the challenge of getting students to schedule exams earlier in the week vs. on Friday/Saturday; whether or not there is actually a need for this service and if the data exists to support the need; if students would be willing to pay for the convenience; and whether it might be more prudent to target high capacity classes first.

Due to the many variables, it was suggested Clements take the information, suggestions, and comments discussed during the meeting and form a plan. Clements and Thomas will bring this plan to the next committee meeting for presentation.

Review of forced rank activity

Thomas showed a heat map of all the committee members' responses, and noted immediately that based on the responses, some items did not seem important while others seemed very important. Funding exclusions for computing fees was very popular, along with centralization of learning space installations, software availability, and others. The point was made that there simply isn't enough funding in general to address all priority items. The committee discussed putting together a presentation for SITC that covers the core issues being dealt with year after year in regards to funding and student computing fees. Thomas said he would put everything together into a road map to be presented at the next meeting, and to be adjusted as necessary.

Progress on survey for Learning Spaces – student needs and perspective

Burrows gave an update on this survey, saying he, Jon Thomas, Scott Sherman, and Cassandra Van Buren have met multiple times on getting a survey draft put together, and that it will be created in Qualtrics soon. Burrows suggested everyone on the Teaching & Learning committee should take a look at the finished survey draft before it is distributed this fall.