The Classroom Upgrade Committee has done several things to date:

1. Our most decisive action is to establish a policy disallowing food and drink in the classrooms. Signs have been posted all over campus in and around classrooms.
2. We commissioned a survey of all classrooms on campus, with information about size, the number of seats, internet ports, and other technological equipment. This information will be available in a web-accessible and searchable database in the near future.
3. We developed a spectrum of differential technology levels for classrooms (attached) on the assumption that not all classrooms need to be equally technologically sophisticated, since faculty have different technology needs and interests.
4. We drew up a list of priority factors (attached) on the basis of which to determine priorities for expenditures.
5. We made recommendations for the priorities for upgrades during the summer 2001, to be ready to occupy during Fall Semester 2001.
   a. Supplying technology at the enhanced level for three large classrooms being created in Alumni Memorial Hall
   b. Supplying technology at the standard level for one smaller classroom in Alumni Memorial.
   c. Three large classrooms in HSS - two at the standard level (HSS71, HSS60), one at the enhanced level (HSS121)
   d. Twelve classrooms n HSS at the basic level (HSS101, HSS103A, HSS103B, HSS104, HSS105, HSS112, HSS113, HSS114, HSS115, HSS118, HSS119, HSS120)
   e. Six classrooms in HSS which were refurbished last year will receive basic technology (HSS106, HSS107, HSS108, HSS109, HSS110, HSS111)
6. We authorized enhanced janitorial services for the areas being upgraded to protect the equipment.
7. We made several recommendations to the Provost that fall outside our budget – notably, a need for an extensive upgrade of the air conditioning system in HSS as a capital maintenance item in the University budget.
8. We solicited proposals from the Deans of the colleges for discipline-specialized needs.
9. This semester, we are working through the Deans' proposals and formulating priorities for the upgrades to recommend for the 2001-2002 academic year.

– Glenn C. Graber

PRIORITY FACTORS

In determining to which classrooms the funds should be applied, there appear to be nine major considerations:

A. Source of funds: The Facilities Fee is a student assessment. The majority of the money comes from payments by lower-division undergraduate students, whose instructional spaces are usually the least sophisticated, because no discipline has invested its funds in facilities not controlled by the discipline. The facilities fee should, therefore, be targeted toward general-purpose instructional facilities which serve lower-division undergraduates.

B. Numbers of students served: The number of seats within a classroom and the number of hours per day it is scheduled for instruction are the components of this criterion.

C. Diversity of technology requirements: The uses of technology are largely a matter of discipline requirement and individual faculty pedagogical style. In order not to install technology that will be seldom used, a diversity of technological levels in the upgraded classrooms is desirable.

D. Greatest results from limited funds: Grouping classrooms to be upgraded within a facility assists in keeping infrastructure and custodial costs to the minimum. Standardizing equipment and furnishings results in savings from more competitive bidding by providers. In addition, the possibility of allocating some funds for "topping off" funds provided by Colleges or departments for upgrading facilities that are made available for general purpose use after instructional scheduling by the discipline providing part of the money will make the funds go farther. It should be noted, however, that the humanities and social sciences, among other disciplines, do not have the capacity of Business or Engineering for fund-raising or reallocation of overhead funds, so this cannot be a prime criterion lest the rich get richer and the lower division undergraduate students continue to be underserved.

E. Avoidance of "lost costs": The institution has a list of renovations which it annually presents to the State as part of the capital outlay process. Buildings not on the current list (Alumni Memorial, Law, Claxton, Humanities and Social Sciences, McClung Museum, Nursing, Dabney/Buehler, Walters Life Sciences, Art/Architecture represent opportunities for enhancement which will not result in lost costs. Glocker is anticipated to be funded next, followed by Estabrook and Ayres. Investment in the top three projects on the renovation list at any given time should probably be limited. Projects on the list, but not within the top three are probably far enough away not to result in substantial lost cost, since technology will change prior to their being taken out of service.

F. Specialized Discipline Facilities: In some instances, such as the Language Laboratory, Mathematics laboratories which require specialized software, or the need of the College of Human Ecology for a specialized teaching space which is essentially a simulation of Early Child

Development Center activities, the instructional space may not be appropriate for general use by other disciplines, but is fully booked for the instructional needs of the discipline. Many such spaces serve large numbers of students at the lower-division level.

G. Unforeseen needs: Flexibility to meet unforeseen needs for classroom upgrading in the infrastructure area (e.g., replacement or installation of window air conditioners in buildings without central HVAC systems, additional blackboards, replacement of window blinds, carpet replacement, etc.) is needed, and program reviews or curricular modification may trigger additional unforeseen needs.

H. Accreditation requirements: Flexibility to meet needs for instructional spaces which are pointed out by accreditation reviews is needed.

I. Building system problems: In some instances, such as HSS, a major building system requires upgrade. In that instance, the problem is with the old, two-pipe HVAC system. While some abatement of unacceptable conditions can be made by individual consideration of change-over to heat or air-conditioning, repair of the building system (in excess of $1,000,000) would be beyond the scope or intent of the funds available from the Facilities Fee. When such problems are identified, it will be more appropriate for the Committee to recommend that a capital maintenance project be requested from the State to address the issue. Capital maintenance funds are separate from capital outlay funds, and the institution generally gets its first or first two priorities for expenditure of funds on projects that will cost in excess of $1,000,000 but are not of the magnitude to require a capital outlay project.

The following "expenditure plan" proposes a system of expenditure for the annual $1,100,000 that can be focused primarily on upgrading classrooms that will be used for a substantial amount of time by undergraduates, provides a mix of technological enhancements at the first three levels of sophistication, assumes that any savings resulting from enhancements to classrooms which already have some of the elements required will be first allocated to ensure the completion of the year's program and then added to the funds made available for "unforeseen," immediate-need, or "topping off" projects. It should be noted that a college or unit could, additionally, elect to add funds to move an upgrading to the next level in any instance.

The plan would upgrade at least 71 general purpose classrooms over the five-year period, allocate $1,200,000 over the period for specialized discipline-specific upgrades (which can be targeted toward graduate or professional studies), provide a total over the period of $279,500 to meet immediate or unforeseen needs or provide "topping off" funds for a College or Department which was investing in classroom upgrade, and allocate $120,000 for differential custodial services in the upgraded classrooms.

Instructional Equipment	Technology Level				
	BASIC	STANDARD	ENHANCED	SPECIALIZED	INTERACTIVE
2 ports at instructor's area	X	X	X	X	X
overhead projector on cart	X	X	X	X	X
LCD projector and laptop computer on cart	X				
ceiling mounted LCD projector		X	X	X	X
wireless capability for student access by laptop	X	X	X	X	X
instructor's podium with control panel, VHS VCR, ELMO visual presenter, laser disk/DVD player, tower computer and laptop computer hook-up		X	X	X	X
ELMO 35mm slide to video transfer unit			X	X	X
sound system		X	X	X	X
wireless microphone		X	X	X	X
35mm slide projector				X	X
video cameras				X	X
smartboard		X	X	X	X
compact disk player / cassette deck				X	X
ports at student stations					X
multiple ports at instructor's console					X
microphones at student stations					X
opaque projector				X	
other specialized equipment				X	