

-----DRAFT-----

UW-Madison InfoLab Planning Task Force  
Strategic Plan Status  
October 31, 2005

## Introduction

The InfoLab program, along with the Kiosk and Laptop services, provides students, faculty, staff and guests access to computing resources on the UW-Madison campus. These resources include hardware, software, high-speed Internet access and on-site assistance.

According to survey data, the number of hours students spend online is increasing. This is reflected in ongoing heavy usage of UW campus InfoLabs, however, student needs are evolving. With consistent rise in computer ownership over recent years, most notably laptop computer ownership, along with wireless Internet access, fewer students need access to basic technology through traditional computer labs. Informal learning spaces may be one way to best address the needs of new students.

There were a number of factors that led to a planning effort for the campus InfoLabs, the first of which was an announcement of a new campus master plan in the summer of 2004. At that time, several UW-Madison building projects were underway or on the horizon, and there was hope that designers would consider new directions in learning space design to best meet changing user needs.

In the Fall of 2004, the National Learning Infrastructure Initiative or NLII (now the EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative or ELI) held a Focus Session on "Learning Space Design for the 21st Century" which explored learning space design principles as a way to enhance and transform teaching and learning with technology, and make it possible for faculty and students to engage in active learning. Changes to learning space theory suggest designing effective technology-enabled learning spaces.

When UW-Madison InfoLab and library staff toured the new learning spaces at the University of Chicago they began thinking about changes that could be made on the Madison campus. In addition, one UW-Madison library approached the DoIT with a desire to design innovative learning spaces as part of their InfoCommons Plan. Other UW libraries have either completed similar projects or are investigating what would best meet the needs of their users.

In May of 2005, EDUCAUSE's Diana Oblinger presented her findings on how educating the "Net Generation" differs from previous generations to campus and DoIT staff. This reinforced the idea that student needs are changing and instruction is changing to meet these needs.

New buildings and remodeling projects provide a unique opportunity to evaluate computer labs. While traditional labs are still very popular, students are asking for additional types of spaces.

This document is meant to provide an update of the current status of the InfoLab planning process. The update was requested by the project sponsors and will provide background material for an additional planning project entitled the Learning Landscape Study (see Appendix A for more detail).

## Purpose

Although UW-Madison InfoLab Managers meet regularly as a service team to address programmatic issues, including administration, operations and tactical planning, there was no focus on longer term or strategic planning. In the spring of 2005, a UW Division of Information Technology (DoIT)-sponsored Strategic Planning effort was sanctioned by the Director of DoIT's User Services.

An InfoLab Planning Task Force was suggested to address longer-term and strategic planning at the campus level. The Task Force includes some of the InfoLab Managers Service Team members, but is not to replicate the work of the InfoLab Managers service team.

The InfoLab Planning Task Force is charged with developing a strategic roadmap for the UW-Madison InfoLabs. The team has been asked to generate a strategic plan and provide input to an operational plan for campus InfoLabs. A roadmap of current services with additional plans for 2 and 4 years will align with UW-System Financial and Administrative Planning efforts.

UW-Madison's strategic plan identifies five priorities for the first decade of the new century. One of the five priorities is to Advance Learning. Designing learning spaces based on best practices in learning theory will contribute to this goal.

## Participation

The InfoLab Planning Task Force reflects broad campus representation. Its membership includes representatives from DoIT, UW-Madison libraries and academic departments. The team members are key players who will ultimately be drivers of the InfoLab roadmap, and who are most aware of InfoLab stakeholder needs.

The Task Force includes:

DoIT Communications Staff (Mary Evansen)

DoIT Academic Technology (Carole Turner, with Dan LaValley and Blaire Bundy as alternates)

DoIT User Services (Sandee Seiberlich – Chair, John Staley and Henry Huang who also represents the Memorial Library InfoLab)

Facilities Planning and Management (Tom Wise, Space Management)

Helen C. White College Library (Dave Luke)  
L&S Learning Support Services (Bruno Browning)  
Health Sciences Learning Center (Adrian Gay)

An additional library representative (Lee Konrad-Memorial Library) has met with the group periodically.

The planning effort is sponsored by Dana Bunner, Director, DoIT User Services, and Kathy Christoph, Director, DoIT Academic Technology. Chris Holsman, in his role as Associate Director of DoIT User Services, was an initial sponsor of this project.

The planning process has also drawn upon the expertise of campus stakeholders, as outlined in the Environmental Analysis section of this report.

## Process

Several strategic planning models were drawn upon, including John Bryson's "Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organization", Bradford and Duncan's "Simplified Strategic Planning" and "Team-Based Strategic Planning" by C. Davis Fogg to supplement the training and experience of the chair/facilitator.

A kickoff meeting was held in March 2005. A list of key questions, provided by the main project sponsor, was at the heart of the initial discussion (Appendix B). The group held 90-minute working meetings approximately every 3 weeks over the summer of 2005, and continues to meet bimonthly work through a strategic plan. The InfoLab Planning Task Force will move ahead with their planning efforts and the team members see great value in ongoing partnership.

The team plans to continue working toward stated goals, which include raising campus awareness of the need for innovative learning spaces that address the needs and desires of today's technologically savvy users. The group would also like to continue to gain knowledge of value to campus planning efforts in order to assure greater involvement in said efforts at the onset of planning.

After the kickoff meeting, the team updated the InfoLab mission statement, agreed upon a set of operating principles and created a list of core values. The updated Mission Statement follows (DoIT would add "meet the needs of our partners" to this statement.):

*Ensure general access to computing technology resources in order to support the instructional and academic pursuits of all students.*

The Task Force must follow the UW-System Financial Administrative Policy for Laboratory and Classroom Modernization and General Computer/Network Access F48. (see <http://www.uwsa.edu/fadmin/fppp/fppp48.htm> for the full document)

General Computer Network Access Fund (GCAF) mandates:

80 hours per week across all labs  
Work around \$30,000 for remodels  
Funds must not be used for staffing

## Environmental Analysis, including SWOT analysis

As background to an environmental analysis, the task force reviewed the current body of research surrounding the relation of learning space theory to learning theory. UW-Madison was fortunate to have Dianna Oblinger, Vice President of EDUCAUSE present her work regarding the Net Generation (see <http://www.educause.edu/educatingthenetgen> for the full text) on campus. In addition, Carole Turner provided her presentation on learning spaces to the InfoLab Planning Task Force.

The internal (campus) environmental analysis included compiling an inventory of products and services currently provided by the InfoLabs (see Appendix C for a comprehensive list). The group then visited several UW-Madison sites to assess the current state of learning spaces on campus. Site visits included Helen C. White, Memorial Library, the Health Sciences Learning Center, Pharmacy, Engineering and Wendt Library.

A shift to collaborative learning spaces can already be seen at the libraries. Quiet and conversational spaces along, with a change from rows of computers to “pods” are some of the changes already implemented. Many of these projects are documented in photos, available in digital format, upon request.

Discussion regarding announced building and remodeling projects has been ongoing. UW Housing is in the process of building a number of new dorms, which will house a number of smaller labs, as opposed to the larger labs currently found in housing facilities. In addition, two of the most heavily used spaces on campus (College and Memorial libraries) are planning to make changes to their learning spaces.

Survey data, including results of the DoIT Student Computing Surveys and Faculty/Staff Surveys were studied to get a better idea of campus attitudes toward the InfoLabs. The College Library InfoLab has recently completed their own user survey and the task force will be looking at the results soon. The group hopes to provide input to survey designers in the future to gather information of value to ongoing planning efforts.

InfoLab usage statistics were also of interest to the team. For example, in 2004 there were over 1.2 million visits across all InfoLabs, with 27,000 unique users. The spring of 2005 yielded 698,048 total visits and 26,396 unique users.

Lab usage has continued to increase, at a modest rate each year, for the past 5 years. This increase can be attributed in part to convenient access to technology and the wide variety of resources available in the labs, such as cost-prohibitive software, fast Internet access, and help desk services.

A SWOT analysis was completed as part of the environmental evaluation. Please see Appendix D for a complete list of InfoLab strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

The InfoLab Planning Task force began a Stakeholder Analysis by discussing customers and primary stakeholders. InfoLab customers are comprised mainly of UW-Madison students. Faculty and instructional staff have a vested interest in the future of the labs, as they rely on them for online assessment and expect technology resources needed for their courses to be available to all of their students.

InfoLab Customers include:

Instructional staff

General UW staff

Students

Visitors (conference attendees, prospective students and community members)

PEOPLE program students (and other Wisconsin Idea partners)

DoIT staff (including SITI)

Student Organizations (InfoLabs are used as voting centers for student government elections)

Continuing Education students

General Public (including some Special Students and Auditors)

InfoLab Stakeholders:

Instructional Staff

Faculty

SOAR program management and participants (laptop rentals)

DoIT Help Desk

Wisconsin State Legislature

UW-Madison Libraries

Memorial Union and Union South management and staff (labs and kiosks are located in Unions)

Campus Partners with labs and kiosks (e.g. Recreational Sports)

InfoLab sponsors

CAE

Wendt (developed the login systems in use by the InfoLabs)

All Lab Sponsors (DoIT and other)

Stakeholder focus meetings were held with library representatives and students. The group will be meeting with instructional support staff and faculty in the near future.

The students had some very interesting comments. They confirmed that some majors do the vast majority of their work on group projects (especially Engineering).

Students said they will not go to a lab without other resources available (such as a library). According to the focus group, the lab in itself is not a destination. Students would like their campus life resources available under one roof.

Lab managers mentioned that even when there are lines of students waiting to use a computer, students cannot be persuaded to go to another lab location, even if the location is just across the street. The students responded that they are creatures of habit and stated that they are looking for the particular "experience" their favorite locations provide. They have generally decided which lab they will be using before they begin their journey and may be meeting others at that location.

The library information sharing session included Ed VanGemert and Lee Konrad of Memorial Library, along with Deb Helman of Wendt library. Ed and Lee have completed extensive work on the second floor of the library and are now looking at the first floor. Deb has also seen extensive recent renovations at Wendt. It is interesting to note that digital media means collections are shrinking in some locations. This is freeing up space which might be repurposed for collaborative learning space. (Meeting minutes are available upon request.) The Task Force would like to continue to share information with the library through quarterly meetings, if possible.

External environmental analysis (benchmarking) discussions began with a request to CIC lab contacts from the Associate Director of DoIT User Services. A set of interview questions was developed and responses were gathered (these can be found in Appendix D). The Ohio State University computer lab management participated in a video conference with the InfoLab Planning Task Force. (Minutes from the meeting are available upon request.) The task force will continue to contact additional institutions to complete the CIC benchmarking project.

A request from the CIC to present the project process and findings, to date, was filled by a presentation in September at the 2005 TechForum. (see: <http://www.cic.uiuc.edu/groups/CIOTechForumPlanningCommittee/archive/ConferencePresentation/TechForum2005/ForumProg.shtml> - select the Tuesday 1:30 Learning Environments .pdf download to view the PowerPoint slides). There was also discussion of sharing plans with CIC schools at an upcoming Tech Forum, through a CIC special interest group, or using flickr to share photos. A site visit to tour learning spaces at the University of Chicago and Northwestern University is scheduled for early November.

Exemplary learning space models were also evaluated via the Internet. These were projects suggested by various people, including Dianna Oblinger and peers who had visited particularly innovative or interesting sites. As members of the task force attended meetings at other campuses, they were invited to share their impressions with the group.

A list of InfoLab issues was generated and thoroughly evaluated by the group. Issues deemed tactical were relegated to a separate list for use in operational planning (see Appendix F for tactical issues). An overarching or grand strategy statement was developed and strategic issues were prioritized (as were tactical issues).

## Grand strategy statement

Design InfoLab Space and Services to best serve the needs of the UW-Madison campus, which align with learning space best practices, as defined by learning space research.

## Strategic issues or challenges

### **Strategic Focus**

How to best design Technology-Enabled Learning Spaces. These include spaces with wireless access, along with those that house computers. This includes:

**Designing New Space** - Getting involved in building projects to provide expertise and advice to space planners and design teams. New space should be varied and should incorporate quiet space/silent space, group space/individual space, tables to spread out with a laptop/space equipped with a computer. The biggest challenges include:

- Getting access to Space Planners at the start of project planning
- Determining Learning Space Locations – This includes the placement (on campus and within buildings) and number of technology-enabled learning spaces.

**Upgrading existing InfoLabs** to best meet the needs of users and stakeholders utilizing Learning Space theory best practices. This includes more collaborative or group space and better access to electrical power.

**Access to Computing** - Continuing to improve access to computing by monitoring and responding to user needs regarding state-of-the-art hardware, equipment for loan (numbers and types of devices), wireless, printing, software and adaptive technologies.

**Assistance with Technology** (Help Desk function) – Be prepared with plans to support new campus products. Assist in promotion and distribution of new products.

**Visibility** – Continue to be seen as a vital campus resource for technology access and services. Work with a wide range of campus partners.

## Next Steps

The InfoLab Planning Task Force will continue to work toward issue-specific strategies and timelines. Goals for monitoring and evaluating the plan will be developed.

## Contact

Sandee Seiberlich  
DoIT User Services

Resources:

John Bryson, "Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations"

Robert W. Bradford and J. Peter Duncan, "Simplified Strategic Planning"

C. Davis Fogg "Team-Based Strategic Planning"

Kaplan and Norton's "Strategy-Focused Organization"

Kathleen Paris, Office of Quality Improvement, UW-Madison, "Strategic Planning in the University"

"DoIT Strategic Planning Process"

UW-Madison Strategic Plan ([www.chancellor.wisc.edu/strategicplan](http://www.chancellor.wisc.edu/strategicplan))

"InfoLabs, Kiosks, and Laptops Operating Plan"

Stephen R. Acker, The Ohio State University & Michael D. Miller, University of Michigan for EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research, "Campus Learning Spaces: Investing in How Students Learn"

Diana Oblinger, UW-Madison Symposium, 2005.

"Educating the Net Generation", Diana G. Oblinger and James L. Oblinger editors

Carol Turner, "Learning Spaces: Computing Labs and Informal Areas" PowerPoint presentation, 2005

## Appendix A

### **Discussion about Learning Landscape Study (Draft) Proposal**

(Shirley Dugdale, architectural strategic consultant, Ken Frazier and Kathy Christoph)

The InfoLab Task Force goal: Talk about Infolabs as Learning Spaces, Create a Roadmap and look at Strategic Directions, 1 year, 2 year, 4 years out. There are Key Questions to answer within this group that Sandee has created/compiled.

The Learning Landscape study (draft proposal) is broader in scope, landscape study of campus, with informal learning spaces, not looking at the just Infolabs. The study will involve many campus buildings. This landscape study is to connect with the master plan, so Ken can talk about learning and learning spaces which might be missing from the campus planning conversation.

The Learning Landscape Study involves most of the same groups that are involved with the InfoLab Task Force (except Unions). The Learning Landscape Study goals are broader. InfoLabs are a subset in this landscape study. The Landscape study will do some pilots of non-technology spaces (Historical Society Reading Room).

The Task Force is already talking about 3.3 (Research relevant best-of-breed models for new types of informal learning spaces)

Can efforts be utilized by the Landscape Study that have already been discussed/completed by Task Force? Avoid duplication. Task Force does not want the landscape study to redo their work.

There are opportunities here for Task Force – to use the landscape study, build upon it, use the data. How do we connect the two? Ken Frazier wants to use the Learning Landscape study to talk more with campus planners, present findings about informal learning spaces.

Task Force is discussing the same issues, and has responses already to some key questions. Task Force (Sandee) can write these up and provide these responses to group and to Kathy Christoph.

Landscape Study discussion started at different times yet are related. Timing is that study will do “something” in fall.

Have Kathy Christoph as sponsor of both attend the Task Force meeting and discuss.

## Appendix B

### Key Discussion Questions

We have seen no significant drop in InfoLab usage. What is going on around the nation? Can we put together a vision for the next two to four years?

What do we need to meet the needs of students?

What is the goal of the labs?

Where do they need to be located?

What is the vision of the InfoLab program?

Where will we go/what will we do to meet that?

How significant is the vision of the labs and how does the role of instruction come into play?

What role will new technology such as handhelds and wireless play?

Where does the vision take the labs? More? Less? Bigger?

What should be going on in the lab? What is it there to do?

What are students doing now?

How will InfoLabs relate space (kiosks/laptops indicate that labs might not be spaces)?

How will Infolabs relate to students and access to technology?

How can libraries/InfoCommons tie into the labs?

As buildings are built, how does the InfoLab mission fit in and what happens when buildings come down?

At what point do we need to get involved in the building process? e.g. HSLC

How do we tie labs to classrooms?

Computers are cycled every three years. What if the vision doesn't include computers in the same way?

If this group could influence the '07-'09 biennium budget, what would the vision be?

## Appendix C

### **InfoLab Services (Present)**

Access to lots of software titles

Access to computers

Kiosks (55, heavily used, depending on location—19 key locations)

Wireless access (introduced in 2000)

Fast Internet access (surf the Internet) (bandwidth)

Network access

Access at all times

Stable, reliable computers

Virus-free computers

Hardware distribution:

Laptop loan (began with 10 5 years ago, now there are 400+ available in 12 locations/duration is either 4 hours or 3 days)

iPod checkout (for semester)

Still cameras

Video cameras

Hard drives

Firewire Drives

Disk drives

Headphones

Mice

Place to meet friends/check in

Place to do “stuff” between classes

Soda, snacks, restaurants nearby

A comfortable chair to take a nap

A place to get away from distractions

Group work space

Software consulting for users

Multimedia hardware, software support

Just-in-time expert advice

Help Desk “satellite services”<sup>1</sup>

Tech support (esp. for wireless)<sup>2</sup>

Disk Repair (floppies & zip)<sup>3</sup>

One-on-one support

PDA support

Hand-held network access (LSS, HSLC—all med students have PDAs)

Training of users (ad hoc and coordinated/DoIT P&TE)  
Training of lab staff  
Lab Consultant Development

Printing  
Color Printing  
Transparency printing  
Large format printing  
Wireless printing setup

General scanning  
Scanning to email (a couple libraries offer @ no charge)  
Slide scanning

DVD & CD resources  
Training CDs  
Music clips  
Clip art  
Photos  
Videos  
1000 items in lab to check out (College)

Download of current virus software and service packs  
Clearinghouse  
Handouts on issues like foreign language text entry  
Many issue-specific printed materials

Sales of disks (floppies, zips, CDs, DVDs)<sup>4</sup>  
Video & audio editing  
Video telephony rollout @ LSS (for language practice)  
Video conferencing @HSLC  
Voice over IP (people bring mics)—can be distracting

Classrooms (either equipped, or NMC)<sup>5</sup>  
Cluster labs with 5 computers (HSLC) – some have digital microscope

Testing/training center<sup>7</sup>

Can install software for instruction  
Conduit for courseware, instructional materials  
Discipline-specific courseware

Adaptive technology:  
Software  
Hardware

Furniture  
Braille display  
Braille printer  
Text readers  
Screen magnifiers  
Adaptive software for learning disabilities (e.g. dyslexia)

<sup>1</sup> Often receive calls about home computers

<sup>2</sup> 50% of questions are regarding users' personal computers, wireless access constitutes 25% of questions. We are not licensed/insured to work on personal laptops.

<sup>3</sup> The number of requests is going down

<sup>4</sup> Through vending machines (\*flash in future) in Steenbock, Memorial and College (operated by DoIT Tech Store)

<sup>5</sup> Can be reserved by students (not advertised). ARCH has HSLC

<sup>6</sup> Not able to reserve yet (coming soon). Takes more space. Don't have a place for students to practice PowerPoint. Could be equipped space or not. Demand exceeds availability.

<sup>7</sup> Not part of InfoLabs any more. Some instructors do bring in groups. HSLC still does proctored.

## **Issues/Notes**

Some services are unique to certain locations.

Collaboration between InfoLab and library may mean that InfoLab provides the equipment.

Technology will drive use (e.g. tablet PCs)

InfoLabs could distribute CDs for the HelpDesk rather than just facilitate downloads.

How do people find a computer when they need to if computers are spread out (there are lines in some locations now).

As more interactive voice/video (sound) is used, more private space will be needed.

DoIT Help Desk requires wireless problems to go to the walk-in Help Desk and often the problem cannot be replicated with that location change.

What effect will iSights and other Web cams have?

## Appendix D

### **SWOT Analysis**

#### STRENGTHS

Labs serve students/staff to suit their computing needs  
Most of the campus labs are located in convenient locations  
Labs in some other schools are not staffed. Most of our labs are staffed.  
Well-funded in terms of equipment and software  
Consortium-like organization (with lab managers, DoIT, etc.  
Campus support (labs are seen as important and need to continue to exist)  
Students go there for social activities  
Group workspace  
Staff available to help  
Good, reliable network access  
Place to meet friends  
Open all hours  
Good communication between lab managers  
Labs are well known and heavily used  
Convenient locations  
Diversity  
Many labs in various locations and academic settings  
Labs combined with library and other facilities (in same space in partnership)  
Discounts on software for students  
Wide variety of software  
Current software  
Up-to-date hardware  
Up-to-date equipment  
Skilled, professional staff  
Managers able to manage many student staff well  
Quality service, given high volume/use  
Qualified & customer-oriented staff  
Adequate funding from various sources  
Adequate funding  
(Plus - Any additional services we think we did well)

#### WEAKNESSES

Name recognition/brand  
Number of computers available  
Computing needs of different labs (for funding/resources)  
Space constraints  
Lack of group study space  
Space is an issue for some labs  
Cost of operation

Staffing at peak times  
Printing double-sided (paper waste)  
No coherent plan for the future (i.e., need for strategic planning)  
Help staff is made up of students. Their priority is to go to school vs. working. Staffing is sometimes difficult.

## OPPORTUNITIES

Students go there for social activities  
Wireless spots provide flexibility not possible in past  
Wireless means opportunities for space configurations  
More computer ownership means less need for desktop machines  
Wireless network expanding on campus will (may?) help decrease demand in labs  
Mobile delivery (laptops, PDAs, iPods)  
New Technologies (Notepad computers, handhelds, portable devices)  
Expanded wireless  
Better network  
Smaller laptops/computers  
Network video  
Cost of technology going down—able to do more with less  
Labs will always be the first to introduce new technology to students  
As technology changes, students' needs change  
New opportunity every year to educate freshmen on what Labs offer  
Training of staff to gain new skills, refine current skills  
This InfoLab Task Force – created to generate new ideas  
Networking with other institutions for ideas  
Interest/momentum nationally about Learning Spaces  
Lots of new construction  
New or renovated buildings in the future  
Incorporate lab concept in new buildings  
Tie-in with library talks about their spaces  
Course-specific needs (software, etc.)  
Faculty are more receptive to/reliant on course-related software in Labs  
Campus administration support lab concept

## THREATS

Decreasing state funding  
Funding uncertainty  
Budget cuts possible (by legislature, campus, DoIT, etc.)  
Technology changes impact need for labs  
Staffing issues, especially at peak times  
Staff reductions  
High turnover among student help  
Labs are overloaded at peak times. Users are waiting in lines.  
Not all labs have the same things (i.e. laptop checkout)

Students may violate copyright laws in labs

Advancement of wireless

Departmental labs

Campus space issues

Technology changes

Blurring distinctions between Infolabs and other units (e.g. library)

DoIT program vs. DoIT-funded program

Faster Internet access at home (DSL, etc.)

Laptops get smaller/lighter or other mobile technology

## Appendix E

### CIC BENCHMARKING – QUESTIONS

The questions below are guidelines for telephone interviews to be conducted with CIC contacts who responded to requests from Chris Holsman and Carole Turner.

How do you define a (computer or technology) lab?  
(Hopefully, they will discuss the type of space, location, resources, whether they partner with others such as libraries for resources)

Who makes the final decisions regarding labs on your campus (policy decisions, direction, etc.)?

How do you think you will define a lab in five years?

Are you currently involved in a planning effort with regard to your labs?

Will you be involved in a planning effort in the foreseeable future?

If so, what issues do you think you will face?

What groups do you involve in strategic planning?

How far in the future do you attempt to plan for?

What kind of benchmarking have you been involved with? (Is there any information you would like to share?)

Do you survey your students about their use of technology? If so, can you share your results? (We will share ours.)

Do you think it would be useful to start a lab manager/learning space interest group within the CIC?

Would you be interested in a conference (day or so-long) or meeting surrounding this topic?

Are you or one of your staff planning on attending the CIC Tech Forum? If so, would you be interested in meeting as a group at that time?

The original request from Chris Holsman follows (Carole Turner's made a similar request).

Our campus has launched a computer labs planning task force to help us envision the future of our labs - facilities, technology, services, etc. The task force would like to talk with folks who are also thinking about this subject on CIC campuses. If you or the person(s) at your institution who are responsible for labs would be willing to do this, please send me the contact information. I will forward it to the task force leader for follow up.

Thanks,  
Chris

---

Northwestern:  
name: Kathy Leoni  
e-mail: <mailto:kleoni@northwestern.edu>kleoni@northwestern.edu  
position 1: Mgr Classroom Supp  
IT Academic Technologies  
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
B244  
EV B303  
telephone number: +1 847 467 2358

---

INDIANA

From: Van Gordon, Elizabeth Ann [mailto:vgordon@iupui.edu]  
Sent: Monday, April 04, 2005 4:13 PM  
To: cholsman@wisc.edu  
Cc: Grover, Douglas A  
Subject: RE: Computer Labs Planning

Hello Chris:

Indiana University student computer labs including planning for hardware, software, and services in the labs administered by the central technology organization, University Information Technology Services (UITS), is in my portfolio. As is the case with many universities, our operations are funded primarily from technology fees paid by students. Our fairly large operation which includes 80+ labs and over 1600 machines is managed by Doug Grover, grover@indiana.edu . I've copied him on this response as he is the most knowledgeable about our student computer lab operation. Doug also played a key role in the recent planning and implementation of our Information Commons in the University Library at the Bloomington Campus. The IC is extremely popular and successful. So successful that we recently expanded the IC to the second floor of our library with 90+ more seats. Doug played a critical in that project as well.

Faced with funding shortages, we are looking at developing strategies that will permit continued, quality services. I suspect many higher education institutions are facing similar situations.

Good luck with your review!

Sincerely,

Beth

Elizabeth A. Van Gordon  
Director, Learning Technology Operations  
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

535 West Michigan Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202-5157  
317-274-3022

2711 East 10th Street  
Bloomington, Indiana 47408-2671  
812-856-3022

On 5/2/05 5:47 PM, "Grover, Douglas A" <grover@indiana.edu> wrote:

Henry,

Thanks for getting in touch.

Who makes the final decisions regarding labs on your campus (policy decisions, direction, etc.)?

There are three components to lab decision-making:

Departmental ownership vs UITs ownership -- many departments have their own computing facilities that are typically accessible only by their own students, and they make all their own decisions about what's in the lab, including whether they will use the Student Technology Centers software build that we make available. Currently, almost all departmental labs are using our build, which provides a common look and feel for students all across campus.

Funding -- Occasionally departments or schools will approach us about creating a new lab. We are funded exclusively by a Student Technology Fee, and we will partner with others to create labs if a) they will contribute funds or something in-kind; and b) the space will be open to all students who pay the Student Technology Fee.

Space -- Our campuses, like many, has a space crunch, and in most cases, any space suitable for a lab is already in use as a conventional classroom whose classes have nowhere else to go. About the only agencies that have any space that would be suitable for new labs are the Main Library, which is the largest building on any of the IU campuses, and Residential Programs and Services, which has shifted to central food courts in specific locations from traditional dining facilities all over campus.

The combination of the three determine how decisions are made. In the past two years, the biggest new facilities have been our Information Commons, opening in fall of 2003, and Information Commons 2, which opened last month. Both of these facilities are in the Main Library, with both Library and UITs funding involved. Because of that partnering, we created an operational governance committee during the three years of planning for the first IC. That committee is responsible for direction, policy, and physical changes to the facilities.

In most other cases, our labs are not seen as joint operations between UITS and the departments whose buildings they are in. There, decisions about policy and direction are made between me and the manager of Student Technology Consulting, whose student employees staff the labs.

How do you think you will define a lab in five years?

We consider ourselves to be instructionally driven; that is, what's in the labs is determined by the instructors who teach in those labs that are classrooms. For example, the Business School's entry level weedout course is business math using Excel. Twice each semester they give a practical exam to the 1500 students who take K201. Their process is that each student turns in a blank diskette with their name on the label; the K201 AI's write a copy of the exam to each diskette, with different versions randomly distributed. When the students show up at their assigned time and place, they get their diskette back, take the exam, and turn the diskette back in. Until the Business School changes that model, I am going to have to keep buying workstations with floppy drives.

Extrapolating from that, I think the labs will be slow to change in nature, because the instructional processes that go on are slow to change. There's no functional difference between the labs today and five years ago other than moving from Zip drives to CD burners. I expect something(s) similar five years from now, but I don't know what it will be -- greater reliance on smart media and thumbstyle storage, probably, and maybe whatever replaces the DVD. But I don't see the basic configuration and use of our facilities to change much.

Are you currently involved in a planning effort with regard to your labs?

An effort begun by my predecessor six years ago was to have a series of meetings each fall with the major departments using our facilities. I have been sporadic about keeping up that tradition, but I do try to keep in touch with key faculty and departmental support staff who know of changes in curriculum and departmental directions that might impact how our facilities are used. But nothing formal.

Will you be involved in a planning effort in the foreseeable future?

If I need to do better about meeting with departments to talk futures, and I do need to, then yes. But it will not likely involve anything structural -- that is, creating new spaces or eliminating old ones.

If so, what issues do you think you will face?

Typically departments look to UITS to provide mass storage for specific disciplines, which is not what we do. They also want to use particular software products they think will meet special needs, and would like me to pay for them. In general, though, issues raised by departments are point-source and of short duration, and we can usually help achieve a solution. But no long-term issues.

What groups do you involve in strategic planning?

Our planning is all tactical -- no more than a year out, possibly two.

How far in the future do you attempt to plan for?

At any given point between August and April, we are planning for May, June, and July, when we swap out a third of our workstations and install the next academic year's software build on all workstations. Anything further in the future is a major structural project like the IC and IC2 were.

What kind of benchmarking have you been involved with? (Is there any information you would like to share?)

Give me an example of benchmarking as it applies to labs?

Do you survey your students about their use of technology? If so, can you share your results? (We will share ours.)

UITS has an annual survey that goes out to a sample of students, faculty, and staff each spring. Because it's at the organization level, there can be only a few questions for each unit, and they tend to be of the "how satisfied are you" form. For a long time, we did not attempt to survey outside of the user survey, because we believed that we would have to go through a rigorous review by the university Human Subjects Committee. We learned recently that as long as publication was not involved, approval was not required. We just completed a web survey for the Information Commons to find out what students were there to use, what they wanted to have that isn't there, and what one thing they would change. Again, that's a point-source kind of thing -- we used the same mechanism to ask about Zip vs thumbdrive usage in order to validate a decision to stop buying Zip drives. The full user survey data back several years is available at <http://www.indiana.edu/~uitssur/>, if you're interested.

Do you think it would be useful to start a lab manager/learning space interest group within the CIC?

Utility can be measured only after the fact; if there's a feeling that lab management in CIC is different from lab management for other groups, or that the nature of CIC would inform or infuse such an interest group, then probably yes.

Would you be interested in a conference (day or so-long) or meeting surrounding this topic?

It would be an excellent way to assess interest in having a more permanent group, yes.

Are you or one of your staff planning on attending the CIC Tech Forum? If so, would you be interested in meeting as a group at that time?

I will plead ignorance to anything about the CIC Tech Forum. When is

it, where is it, who usually attends, etc?

Thank you very much in advance!

Sincerely,

Henry Huang  
Manager, Computer labs, Division of Information Technology, University  
of  
Wisconsin, Madison

You are most welcome!

Doug

---

MINNESOTA

From: Jamil [mailto:jamil@umn.edu]  
Sent: Monday, April 04, 2005 4:52 PM  
To: Chris Holsman  
Cc: Simin Hickman  
Subject: Re: Computer Labs Planning

Hi Chris,

As Simin described, I am one of the ADCS computer facility managers. I've been doing this type of thing here at the U of M for more than 20 years.

I oversee the ADCS computer classroom and lab facilities on the St. Paul Campus. I also maintain the public computer facilities for the College of Biological Sciences.

I'll be glad to share information with you about computer lab technologies. Feel free to contact me about this whenever you like.

Sincerely,

Jamil  
Information Technology Manager

Chris, I am copying two of our lab managers to work with you.  
Jamil Jabr and Peter Oberg.

Simin

Hi Sandee,

I had a lengthy phone conference with Jamil Jabr at the University of Minnesota this morning. Below are some highlights:

\* Jamil is a manager of a service organization similar to DoIT on the St. Paul campus. It is the Academic and Distributed Computing Services, which is part of the Office of Information Technology. ADCS responds to requests from instructors and departments for the creation of lab space. Collaboration is really in the form of working with their customers to design the spaces they need. Student technology fees go directly to colleges with the university. The colleges then contract with ADCS for services.

\* ADCS manages the labs that are in the libraries. From what I could gather, it doesn't sound like the libraries maintain their own computer labs at all. It is done either through ADCS or a similar computing service group on the Minneapolis campus.

\* U of M defines a lab as an educational space that meets the needs of the curriculum. They are moving toward more classroom-type settings for labs, often with theater seating. Their philosophy is: if you build a classroom with technology built in, you have a classroom; if you just build a lab, you don't have a classroom.

\* They partner with libraries and departments on a needs-basis. If the library or department has the resources, ADCS will design a lab based on their needs. On the St. Paul campus there are 9 classroom-type labs and 3-4 open rooms that serve as labs.

\* They are not currently doing any lab planning. They generally plan about 1 year in advance based on the course schedule for the following year. Jamil sees labs evolving as instructors become more familiar and comfortable with technology in the classrooms. Conventional classrooms are becoming more automated and hands-on. Eventually he believes campuses will shrink with more of an emphasis on distance education, etc. but believes that will be a long time in coming. Basically, the goal of the ADCS is to make sure that the labs are prepared for whatever technology the instructors want their students to use.

\* They don't seem to do any benchmarking with other peer institutions. Nor do they do survey their students. Jamil said that have tried to survey students in the past and the students weren't interested in participating. The ADCS focuses mainly on whether their customers (he defined his customers as instructors and departments rather than the students) are happy. He sees their services becoming more transparent the more his customers are happy. Translation: when students can come in to the lab and everything works like it should, they don't pay much attention to the specific services. They just expect them to be there.

\* They do have a mentor program funded by a grant that provides a consultant-type person in the labs who supports graphic design software.

\* They would be interested in sharing any information. Jamil is open to a video conference if we want to do another one after Ohio State. He is also in favor of a lab manager/learning space interest group.

Other interesting info:

\* Jamil does not check IDs or require any identification for students to use the labs on the St. Paul campus. He believes the labs on the Minneapolis campus do check.

\* They out-source their printing to a vendor called Pharos Uniprint. The vendor takes care of equipment, supplies, etc. Students pay with their U-card. Jamil says this has saved them \$100,000 in staff time, equipment and supplies over the course of the past year.

\* They operate on a 3-year turnaround time for machines.

--

Mary Evansen  
Communications evansen@doit.wisc.edu  
Division of Information Technology voice: 608.262.3081  
University of Wisconsin - Madison fax: 608.262.4679

---

Here's a contact name at the University of Minnesota.  
I'll get Shih-Pau's email/phone # too, if needed.

-----Original Message-----

From: Linda Jorm [mailto:ljorm@umn.edu]  
Sent: Sunday, April 24, 2005 12:19 PM  
To: Carole Turner; molly-langstaff@uiowa.edu  
Subject: Re: Planning for Student Computing Labs on your campus

Hi Carole:

I am not directly involved with redesigning learning spaces at this time. Shih-Pau Yen would be the best person to talk with concerning student lab spaces. He works with associate deans in colleges, and at this point the two biggest colleges, Liberal Arts and Institute of Technology, still have the philosophy of designing large computer labs (60 or more computers) with multi-platform computers used for individual work.

---

MICHIGAN

From: raddis@mail.umich.edu [mailto:raddis@mail.umich.edu] On Behalf Of Ruth Addis  
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2005 7:13 AM  
To: Chris Holsman  
Cc: Steve Sarrica  
Subject: Re: Computer Labs Planning

Would love to be involved. We have been tasked to create a "virtual site" (course software available without needing to be sitting at a Sites machine). It would be great to discuss these issues with CIC colleagues.

Contacts are me and the Campus Computing Sites manager, Steve Sarrica.  
Contact information:

Ruth Addis  
email: raddis@umich.edu  
voice: (734) 936-2628  
fax: (734) 763-8937  
Info Tech Central Services  
University of Michigan  
B600 Michigan Union  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1308

Steve Sarrica  
email: sarrica@umich.edu  
voice: (734) 647-2617  
vax: (734) 764-5601  
Info Tech Central Services  
University of Michigan  
Argus Building, Suite 210  
535 W. William  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103-4943

-Ruth

---

IOWA

Chris,

Could you add me to this list. My contact info is:

Chris Clark

E-mail: chris-clark@uiowa.edu  
MSNIM: chris-clark@uiowa.edu  
Tel: 319-335-5651

I'll be up in Madison for a CIC conference in May and would be more than happy to have a discussion at that time, and would also welcome a videoconference around this topic.

-chris

From: Molly Langstaff [mailto:molly-langstaff@uiowa.edu]

Sent: Monday, April 25, 2005 6:07 PM

Subject: Re: Planning for Student Computing Labs on your campus

We are just beginning discussions on our campus about the future of "learning spaces." I chaired a group on campus during Fall 04 that began looking at student computing clusters/computing labs/computer classrooms on campus. We shared info and best practices and decided more study is needed. I expect the new CIO will sponsor a more thorough study next fall.

This spring ITS opened our first "unattended" student lab. It's open 24 hours, no assigned monitors. Students gain access by swiping their student ID card. Seems to be working well.

Our library just received a grant from an Iowa foundation to expand and rejuvenate their "Information Arcade." <http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/arcade/> They are including us in the planning.

We have recently begun discussions on our campus about mobile computing. At the moment, we are looking specifically at expanding the wireless network to cover the entire campus. It covers about 60% of the campus today. We expect mobility to be a big issue in the coming months/years.

That's a snapshot. Let me know if you'd like follow-up information on any of this.

Molly Langstaff

Notes from Chris Clark-Iowa-on labs:

319-335-5651

- even though 90% of students own computers, this # is in no way is related to lab use-
- view lab as convenience piece; go to check email, study, "office" function-groups of students can study together, managed environment
- regular classes scheduled in their labs
- partner with health science library-campus gains economies of scale-printing, etc..
- planning effort to make main library the Help Desk for unattended labs-
- opened new lab-unattended-24 hr access by card swipe-working well, all res hall labs to be unattended 24/7 this fall-gain access by dorm room key;
- for future labs-as long as add value, people will stay and attend
- no 5-10 yr plan now, but interested in seeing/sharing info with others
- survey their students w/ mass email-get generic feedback
- introduced thin client email stations on campus-students very receptive

Tom Wise

---

THE OHIO STATE

Hello,  
Todd and I are best for OSU and are working on a similar project. Contact info below. Thanks!

Brian Newcomb - Manager of Computing Services  
614-292-1013  
Newcomb.18@osu.edu

Todd Wulfhorst - Manager of Student Computer Centers  
614-292-8400  
Wulfhorst.4@osu.edu

Thanks,  
Brian

---

## ILLINOIS

Our computer lab managers at U of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana are Dave Ruby (daver@uiuc.edu) and Steve Zydek (szydek@uiuc.edu).

Terry

---

## MICHIGAN STATE

Email from Bryon Brown:

MSU has a computer requirement: Every undergrad must show up with a computer, either desktop or laptop. There's no requirement that the computer must be a laptop, and there's no operating system requirement.

So why do we continue to maintain almost all of our 60 public computer labs? The initial reason was to continue to make available for student use for their courses of expensive or exotic software. An example would be Photoshop. Our labs also provide laser printing (for a fee), and the labs are also maintained for that service.

We're four to five years into our computer requirement now, and quite naturally lab usage has declined by hasn't gone away. In fact, in the last year and a half there has been a marked increase in lab use, especially for the labs located in dorms. Why? We've concluded it because the lab computers work, and can be counted on to work. MANY students, ignoring advice and large subsidies to use firewall and virus software, have totally mucked up their machines with viruses, worms, trojan horses, etc. So they use the computer labs.

Our computer labs are also HEAVILY used for regular classes, especially those labs not in dorms. Some courses are scheduled into labs as their primary classroom space throughout the semester. Example: a huge computer science course. Others schedule labs for occasional use during a semester. Example: an economics course where the students will get instruction in using a particular piece of statistical software.

What's the future, other than the above, as we see it? Probably converting parts of the lab spaces in dorms, and maybe other areas, to be "non-formal learning spaces." These spaces would have wireless, projectors, maybe whiteboards, and some very comfortable and usable furniture to turn them into cyber-collaborative spaces. We're probably going to have something like this going in our main library by the end of the summer or shortly thereafter.

Contact: Byron Brown  
brownb@msu.edu  
Coordinator of Instructional Technology Support, Office of Libraries, Computing and  
Technology  
(517) 355-2364

---

PURDUE University  
Narrative from Carole Turner:

Contact Ed Evans, edevans@purdue.edu  
I have some notes from a discussion that John Staley and others had with Purdue staff in 2003. They have the Distributed Academic Computing Software System (DACs), collaboratories for courses, and student group work spaces at their computing facility, and they use Condor for distributed computing, and more.

---

University of Chicago  
Email from Emily Baker:

As it happens, my unit is in charge of the centrally managed student labs, and a year or two ago we changed the name of the group to "Learning Environments" in order to try and capture some of the new thinking in this area. You can see little about what we mean at:  
<http://intech.uchicago.edu/cc/index.html>

In May of 2000 we launched one very successful project here, the USITE/ Crerar facility, and we are in the planning/proposal stage of two other large projects in which we hope to take our ideas a step or two further. One proposal is to create a much larger (18,000 sq.ft.), even more integrated space in the lower level of the main campus library. The other is a 10,000 sq.ft. facility to serve students who will be living in a new residence complex at the south edge of campus. This one will take us out of our comfort zone - since our main facilities are either inside or adjacent to the campus libraries.

I'd be glad to chat with you more in depth, if that would be helpful. We could also perhaps arrange a tour/meeting, if you like.

-Emily Baker, Director  
-Learning Environments  
-University of Chicago  
-NSIT Academic Technologies  
[emly@uchicago.edu](mailto:emly@uchicago.edu)

Appendix F

**Tactical Focus**  
Better access to state of the art technology

This can be achieved through:

**Expanded Needs Assessment**

InfoLabs need to survey users regularly regarding their technology usage/needs and space needs. (What they want and what resources should be provided.)

**Equipment for Loan** – Easy access to equipment such as laptops, along with promotion of loan programs, includes additional items such as cameras.

**Assistance with Technology** (Help Desk function) -This includes distribution of anti-virus/anti-Spam software, providing help documentation and help with wireless access via personal laptops, along with assistance with adaptive technologies

**Broader access to Wireless** - Design services to leverage improvements underway for easy access to wireless. The improvements include ubiquitous wireless across campus and automated login/instructional screens that open when a Web browser is started.

**Better Access to Electrical Power** – This might be achieved via under-carpet ribbons, but should be evaluated with all designs.

**Access to Open Machines** – This could include finding ways to balance load between lab spaces that are nearby.

**Broader Access to Printing** – Including more locations. Double-sided printing should be a priority when new printers are purchased.

**Improved dissemination of information of value to users** – This could include departmental, library and DoIT service information.

**Improved Access to Software** There is a role for the Help Desk to provide access to specialized or expensive software titles. Often these are products that are required by a department or school. The goal is to determine how many people this serves and then, if usage warrants, implement an efficient system to serve the software (Purdue has implemented a model worth exploring).

Since the InfoLabs are distributing antivirus software, there may be a role to distribute and negotiate for additional software titles. This could include distributing standard site-licensed software and, after stakeholder needs assessment, negotiating for additional software titles based on stated need.

**Increased Visibility** – Promotion of services should include InfoLabs and partners as sponsors. Visibility of lesser-utilized labs should be increased.

**Guest Logins** – If InfoLabs are distributors of guest logins, the role and process for distribution and support should be well-defined. Consistency across labs would eliminate some of the confusion that exists now. Some flexibility is needed to address the wide range of guest needs. The discussion surrounding this should begin at the lab managers' meeting and should include information security and general library input, as GLS may already have a policy.

The discussion should include whether alumni should be given access and how to communicate the process for obtaining access to guests walking around campus. . (0)

**Access to Remote Testing** – Determination of campus need is the first step in providing this service. It has been requested, however, this may need to be a multi-function space, depending on how many people will use it and how often it will be reserved.

There are several ways to provide machines for testing which could include laptop images or PDAs.