

Idaho State University
Council for Teaching and Learning
Discussion Notes

February 26, 2008

4:00 PM

Business Administration Bldg, BA 403

In Attendance: Campbell, Diedrich, Neill, Reis (Chair), Reynolds (Vice-Chair), Wong
Excused: Adkison, Enos, Groome, Hill, Leung, Lora, Rhoads, Risinger
Absent: Rudd, Smith,
Non-voting: Wallace (Recording Secretary)

1. Preliminaries and announcements

Reis opened the meeting and said several members had let her know they could not attend. No quorum was present, so the record will reflect discussion notes instead of formal minutes.

2. Minutes of January 22, 2008

No quorum was available to vote, so this item was **deferred** until the next meeting.

3. Establish short term sub-committee of 2-3 members; work to be completed within 3 weeks.

Reis has extracted all the room-by-room data from the survey report. She now needs help in prioritizing the information; Wong agreed to help with that project.

4. Discuss Report Recommendations

A draft of recommendations for upgrading classrooms was passed out to Council members. Reis had spoken with Denise Bowen, the Chair of Campus Planning Council. There are no processes in place yet for implementing the recommendations. The CPC is working on a rubric for prioritizing improvement requests, and is interested in this Council's survey results.

Reis briefly reviewed the two recommendations listed so far on the handout:

- minimal standards upgrades prioritized by safety, occupancy, and repairs needed
- general upkeep and maintenance request process

Council members expressed concern that existing maintenance request processes already in place, are not well communicated or known by faculty members. Many faculty do not know how or to whom to report broken chairs, burned out light bulbs, and other such items, especially in classrooms shared by multiple Departments and Colleges. The Council will recommend a standardized process be developed and implemented. Until that is done, some sorts of intermediary steps need to be taken to provide easily accessible information specific to each room as to whom to contact for repairs or maintenance. Although there is a maintenance request form online that is ostensibly available for anyone to use, in practice many departments prefer to restrict its use to authorized staff personnel as a way to control budget costs. Faculty often feel frustrated, believing that the maintenance issues they report are ignored. It is unclear which entity or entities are responsible for classroom upkeep. The lines of responsibility should be clarified.

Another concern was a developing way of communicating long-term Facilities upgrade and maintenance schedules with the faculty so they know when to anticipate work will be done on their buildings and classrooms. Neill noted three categories of concern that he felt should be addressed by whatever policies may result from the Council's ultimate recommendations:

- long-range planning

- routine maintenance
- furnishing and replenishing of supplies

Wong commended the Rendezvous Building for providing one person, Ryan Faulkner, whom faculty can contact whatever their needs; he knows where to direct them if it is not something he handles himself.

Technology Infrastructure was the greatest deficiency identified by faculty in the room survey. The data needs further analysis in order to summarize recommendations to include in the Council's report. There was some discussion about the Library, its technological needs and the impact it has on teaching and research campus-wide. Deidrich reminded the Council that the larger safety and air quality issues are the most important to address, not minor annoyances such as a missing piece of chalk or whiteboard marker.

4. Adjournment: 5:05 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, March 18, 2008** at 4:00 p.m. in BA 403.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Wallace
Administrative Assistant I
Faculty Senate

Approved by Council for Teaching and Learning: March 18, 2008
Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 7, 2008