SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTFOLIO
DATE: August 4, 2016
TIME: 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
LOCATION: Marriott Library, MLIB 5201

IN ATTENDANCE:

Kirsten Butcher	Fernando Rubio	Nancy Lombardo	Cory Stokes
Jon Thomas	Matt Irsik (attending in place of Catherine Soehner)		
Martha Bradley	Wayne Samuelson		

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Paul Burrows, Emily Rushton

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

Rick Ash	Ryan Steele	Patrick Panos	Linda Ralston
Catherine Soehner	Patrick Tripeny	Anthony Oyler	Jesus Hernandez

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:
- Review of Forced Rank Activity for Learning Spaces issues
- Survey discussion
- Telepresence demonstration
- Where does TLP fit in the grand scheme of things

Review of Forced Rank Activity for Learning Spaces issues

Jon Thomas reviewed the heat map showing the top priorities for the portfolio members (chosen at the last meeting during the forced rank activity). The top priority (out of 16 total items) was funding exclusions with student computing fees, followed by the future of computer labs, software availability, and centralized coordination of learning space A/V installations. Thomas pointed out some of the topics overlap or are duplicates, and suggested consolidating the few that are. The portfolio agreed. Thomas suggested the next five portfolio meetings should be dedicated to covering each of the top five priorities from the list (one priority per meeting). The portfolio agreed.

Survey discussion

Paul Burrows asked the portfolio what they thought of the student survey he sent for review. Some portfolio members had concerns that the survey was too long and would discourage students from taking and/or finishing the survey. The portfolio considered possible incentive methods to encourage more participation as well as ways to shorten the survey length. Cory Stokes recommended working with Student Affairs, who has offered to pull a random sample for this survey and manage the distribution of the survey to students. There was a general consensus about involving the help of Student Affairs.

The portfolio agreed to revisit the survey and work on condensing the length, and then they will with Student Affairs to discuss the best methods to distribute the survey.

Telepresence demonstration

Thomas opened by pointing out that education at the U is, for the majority of cases, tied to a physical location. Online classes are available, but most students still take face-to-face classes as well. This becomes difficult for students who are ill, have a hospital stay, are pregnant, have military or jury duties, and so on. Thomas then presented two ideas to possibly combat this issue.

The first was the Swivl Robot, a small circular device meant to hold an iPad to record, and which swivels to follow the professor or student as they walk/talk. The portfolio discussed the pros/cons of this idea, including interruptions to a professor's teaching flow, what exactly the video is capturing vs. what it wouldn't (such as whiteboard notes), and the idea of TLT offering the Swivl Robot as a last-minute delivery service for students and/or professors. The portfolio considered the cost of one robot vs. the cost of TLT sending a student to record a lecture, and determined the already-existing solution TLT offers to be the better one. One member suggested a potential use for the Swivl Robot could be in a conference room.

Thomas then presented the next idea, a self-balancing telepresence robot on a wheeled base that holds an iPad allowing for live two-way communication. Thomas said this idea could be useful for a group-based class that a student is absent from – it could allow that student to still participate in the group experience while being physically away. It could also allow a teacher to be present without physically being in the room. One member suggested this could be helpful to have in the Songdo campus, and another suggested that it could be a cheaper way to include remote participants in classrooms.

Where does TLP fit in the grand scheme of things

Thomas started out by saying that the TLP has two different roles – one involves making decisions about how the learning spaces funds are allocated, and the other is an advisory role to both IT governance and now IST (the Integrated Student Team).

Stokes gave a brief overview of what IST is. IST is a long-term, standing committee charged by Senior Vice President Ruth V. Watkins. It's comprised of directors within Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, undergraduate studies, and associate deans. IST is charged with figuring out the entire student experience, from when the U begins encouraging them to choose the U, all the way through when the students graduate. Currently, students are asked to navigate approximately 35-40 different applications in order to accomplish what they need to do at the U. IST's charge is to think about ways

to improve that, and as new ideas are generated, IST discusses how those ideas fit with and/or impact the current student experience.

Thomas also reviewed the new IT governance structure and explained if the TLP were to come up with a good idea, they could put together a presentation and present it before the ANTC or SITC. The portfolio questioned why that would need to be done (i.e. why need permission). Thomas said it's a matter of funding, measuring, and resources. IT governance can help with that. He clarified that if the idea is something that should involve more groups in the conversation (e.g. virtualization of software), that's when it should go through IT governance. Stokes added that any ideas the TLP would like to pursue could be passed along as a recommendation to IST to determine next steps.

The portfolio then discussed the bigger picture, including the idea of asking for a higher percentage of the student computing fees. The group agreed that a request such as that should be brought directly to UIT leadership. One member made the point that there isn't clearly defined governance around student computing fees. The portfolio agreed that they should look at trends over the past three years that the TLP has been tasked with allocating learning spaces funding, and build an argument based on the identified trends, as well as the requests for funds, and the broad impact on campus.

Stokes pointed out that the TLP covers three kinds of issues. 1) Projects the TLP would like to see happen (e.g. services TLT could add) which would go to IST who would figure out next steps; 2) broader-impact ideas that should be reviewed by the executive level and determined whether or not it should go to IT governance; and 3) lower-level decisions that the TLP makes on a regular basis, with no approval needed, or in the case of learning spaces funding, where the TLP has complete authority. There was general consensus from the portfolio on this.

At this point, the meeting had run over time. The portfolio briefly discussed the plan for the next five meetings, which is to review each of the top 5 priorities individually, and reiterated the need to further discuss the larger issue of requesting a higher percentage of student computing fees.