SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTFOLIO
DATE: January 31, 2017
TIME: 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
LOCATION: Marriott Library, MLIB 5201

IN ATTENDANCE:

Rick Ash	Jack Bender (ASUU)	Kirsten Butcher	Nancy Lombardo
Fernando Rubio	Wayne Samuelson	Catherine Soehner	Ryan Steele
Cory Stokes	Jon Thomas	Patrick Tripeny	

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Paul Burrows, Emily Rushton

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

Marty Bradley	Patrick Panos	Linda Ralston

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:
- Review of developments on Software Anywhere discussions
- Review of student survey findings
- Review Learning Spaces funding timeline
- Policies on Learning Spaces
- Open floor

Review of developments on Software Anywhere discussions

Cory Stokes explained that he brought this topic to both IT governance committees (SITC and ANTC) over the past week. Both committees approved Stokes to act as executive sponsor and put together a working group from ANTC to discover use cases over the next 6-8 months. Ultimately, the goal is to come up with the best solution, best way to deploy, and how much it will cost. At the end of this year, Stokes said he's hoping to have the final estimated cost so the U can begin approaching how to fund it.

Review of student survey findings

Jon Thomas recapped the results of the student technology survey. The primary purpose of the survey was to support the portfolio in making funding allocation decisions, based on technology the students need and services they use and/or value.

The survey was sent to 5,222 randomized undergraduate and graduate students only (excluding freshmen). Of that number, 645 students responded to the survey. The final data set is of 397 students (after filtering out professional schools and PhD students, whom Thomas said seem to have their own specific needs and should be evaluated separately).

Overall, students have a positive experience with technology on campus. Thomas reviewed some of the notable data, including: 97% of students have access to a smart phone; printing and computer labs are used by 53% of students at least once a month; a few services scored low on the usage scale, but the negative impact (if it were to be taken away) jumped up quite a bit(i.e. students don't want to lose this service, even though it's used rarely); and printing, completing assignments, and specialized software are the main reasons students use computer labs. Additionally, many of the free-form responses indicated students would like quiet individual desks to use their own personal devices, with access to power outlets/charging stations.

Kirsten Butcher added that they suspect students are using computer labs more for printing than for actual software and/or computer usage. If they were to repeat this survey next year, she said they would more strategically separate those questions to better identify the primary reason students are using computer labs.

63% of students reported negative impact if labs were to be removed entirely from campus. The portfolio briefly discussed funding for departments that have classes which depend on computer labs, as well the need for data to be collected and stored for each lab to see how often they're used.

Thomas then reviewed the potential priorities to come out of the survey results: 1) reduce the number of workstations (i.e. computers) in regular open labs (but *not* reducing the size of the lab); 2) ensure an easy and common printing service; 3) address the perception of wireless still needing attention; 4) reduce replication of low-usage technologies and services.

The portfolio further discussed the need for lab usage data to be collected. One member suggested LabStats as a solution. There was general agreement that whatever the solution, each college would need to participate, and it would need to be in a consistent format across all labs. Thomas said he would come back to the portfolio with use cases on this. There was also a brief discussion regarding whether or not powered furniture will be funded from the Learning Spaces allocations.

Review Learning Spaces funding timeline

Paul Burrows reviewed the Learning Spaces funding timeline and said everything is on track. In early January, the task force sent out invitations to colleges to apply for funding. Two open houses were held on Jan. 18 and 19, and Friday, January 3 was the deadline for colleges to submit their applications. 45-minute applicant interviews will be held February 13-22, and deliberations will take place on March 28, 29, and 30. During the month of April, award info will be finalized and notifications will be sent to each college. The transfer of award funds will take place at the end of June.

Policies on Learning Spaces

Wayne Samuelson proposed a new policy that would require any committee member to sit out of the deliberations when that committee member's college's proposal is on the table. Samuelson reiterated that this policy proposal was not in response to anything that has ever happened, but he stressed the importance of it in relation to the integrity of the Learning Spaces deliberations. The motion was announced, seconded, and passed with no opposition.

Open floor

Jon Thomas reminded the group that this year installation labor costs have been moved into the "Possibly fund" category, and last year TLT had removed it and simply did not charge departments for labor costs. He asked the group if TLT should do that again this year. Stokes reminded the portfolio that last year, due to a shortage of funds, he had asked TLT to eat the labor costs for a year. At this point, he said, the portfolio needs to decide if that was a temporary adjustment or not so that TLT can know how to quote labor for University departments. Eat the labor, or include it in the quote? The portfolio discussed this for a few minutes, and came to the conclusion that TLT should include the labor cost in each quote this year. The group also decided that for TLT installation services, any Learning Spaces allocations would go into a central fund that departments could pull from (rather than being awarded directly to the departments, who would simply turn around and send that money back to TLT when the services were ordered).