

October 27, 2008

To: Classroom Review Board  
From: Sally Hibbitt  
Re: Minutes of October 27, 2008

Members present: Tamla Blunt, Jack Brouillette, Kristi Buffington, Pat Burns, Dave Carpenter, Mike Hanna, Sally Hibbitt, Loree Morse, Jan Nerger, Mike Palmquist, Doug Satterfield, and Pete Winderscheidt.

Members absent: Brian Chase and Andrew Norton.

Agenda item #1. The minutes of October 6, 2008 were approved.

Agenda item #2. S. Hibbitt re-opened the discussion from the last meeting regarding the Construction Management request to reassign 107 Guggenheim, a general assignment (GA) classroom, to a departmental classroom. P. Burns requested a quick summary of the proposal from the Board after hearing from Mostafa Khattab at the last meeting. A brief summary was provided. Hibbitt asked D. Carpenter if he had the opportunity to converse with Dean April Mason about a possible trade. He had, and reported that the College of Applied Human Sciences has no comparable space to offer in trade.

The Board continued its discussion of potential options to accommodate the department's needs while keeping the GA inventory whole. Since 107 Guggenheim is a departmental first preference room for Construction Management, the following suggestion was made: during First Draft the department could request every time slot available to gain the flexibility they need to make last minute assignments of courses that have not been finalized by the First Draft deadline. This would provide the department the flexibility they currently need, while continuing to keep the classroom in the GA inventory. Several members of the Board expressed concerns that if the room becomes departmentally controlled, over time as Construction Management enrollments decrease due to their recently instituted cap that the room would not be used efficiently or would eventually be used for other functions, such as office space. Burns questioned if Construction Management would be able to move all of their classes currently scheduled into GA classrooms into departmental rooms in the future as they gain more classrooms and if such a reassignment is made. L. Morse agreed that the overall impact would be valuable to understand. K. Buffington indicated the next VPOF meeting is scheduled for 10:00 am on Nov. 6, 2008. Morse and Hibbitt will speak with Khattab and Bell to get a better understanding of their overall future intent. This step will be taken with further communication back to the CRB before any final recommendation is sent back to the Space Review Committee.

Agenda item #3. Hibbitt distributed a document roughly drafted by the sub-committee of L. Morse, J. Brouillette, D. Satterfield and Hibbitt outlining guidelines

for installations of instructor computers in GA classrooms by departments. The idea is to provide computers in the instructor podium and eliminate the need for faculty to haul laptops to their classrooms. Faculty could access files stored on their thumb drive. Hibbitt asked for input on the general concepts covered in the document. J. Nerger felt the document had a negative tone to it and would discourage departments from wanting to participate. Clarification was made that the document is intended to provide guidelines for departments who may want to take such action and is not intended to increase participation from departments who are not interested in providing such a resource. P. Burns suggested that the document be revised with a preamble added. Burns and Hibbitt will work on the revision.

A question was raised about using college tech fees to purchase computers for installation in instructor podiums. D. Carpenter, as representative of the College IT Administrators, indicated these fees would not be appropriate for this purpose. M. Palmquist posed the concept of using terminal services with thin clients. In this model, a central server would host the necessary software programs and the classrooms would have “dumb clients” connecting back to this main server. This would eliminate the necessity of installing more expensive computers and software programs in each classroom. Burns indicated from a central IT standpoint that this solution would not be any less expensive or easy to facilitate. He estimated for approximately \$50,000/year it would be possible to centrally fund hardware for smart classroom podium installations. Burns asked T. Blunt and P. Winderscheidt if this is something worth discussing with the UTFAB and offered to start that discussion. They agreed that it was a reasonable concept for discussion.

Other issues were identified that would have to be addressed, such as regular computer support and maintenance, including patches and upgrades. At the Sept. 15, 2008 meeting, the CRB approved the purchase of a computer to install in A101 Clark for a spring semester pilot. This will help Classroom Support Services gauge how much support this might require when installed in a lecture hall heavily used, across many colleges. It would also be necessary to establish University standards of software available on the computers. For those departments needing specific software applications, instructors would still have the option to bring their own laptop to class.

Other items: Hibbitt announced that the next CRB meeting will be held in 222 Johnson Hall, providing the CRB an opportunity to experience the new classroom and the latest technology.

**The next scheduled meeting is Monday, November 17, 10:00-11:00 a.m., 222 Johnson Hall.**

## **Classroom Review Board**

Monday, November 17, 2008, 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.

222 Johnson Hall

### **AGENDA**

1. Approve the minutes of October 24, 2008.
2. D. Satterfield – Demonstration of audio visual capabilities of 222 Johnson Hall.
3. S. Hibbitt – Classroom problems.

## **Fall 2008 Meeting Schedules**

Monday, December 8, 2008, 10:00-11:00 a.m., 227 Lory Student Center