Kicking the tires on the Learning Space Rating System
Session outline

1. Intro: context and background [5 min]
2. Three campus reports [30 min]
3. Overview of the summer trials [10 min]
4. Discussion
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how does it work?
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Section 1: Integration with Campus Context (ICC) .......................................................... page 9
1. Alignment with Campus Academic Strategy: Align learning spaces learning spaces with strategic academic plans or initiatives, including institutional accreditation and accountability activities.
2. Integration with Learning Space Master Plan: Ensure that the learning space design aligns with a campus learning space master plan.
3. Compatibility with Campus IT Infrastructure and Plans: Ensure that the planning, development, and operation of learning spaces is supported by the institution’s technology infrastructure.
4. Commitment to Evidence-based Research and Assessment: Develop a regular, iterative process of research and assessment to inform development of learning space and to contribute to an institutional culture of evidence based design.
5. Innovation in Integrating Learning Spaces with Campus Context: Provide creative, innovative leadership in integrating learning spaces with the campus academic, strategic, or information technology context.

Section 2: Planning and Design Process (PDP) ............................................................... page 15
1. Stakeholder Engagement: Involve users of the learning spaces and strategic partners in the planning process.
2. Best Practices in Planning and Design: Base planning or design for a specific project on research and/or documented best practices in learning space strategy and design.
3. Pilots and Prototypes: Use the design, installation and testing of a working pilot of a learning space, its tools or other aspects of the design to apply lessons learned, mitigate risk, and increase consensus on the design.
4. Learning Space as a Teaching Tool: Utilize the planning, use, and assessment of a learning space to explicitly demonstrate how space design can enable more effective and innovative teaching and learning.
SO Credit 7: Scheduling Systems

**Intent**
To provide users with a system that enables them to match their teaching and learning needs with learning space availability and capabilities.

1 Point

**Criterion for credit**
Create and maintain a class scheduling software/database, which includes information on space attributes such as total area, area per station/seat, flexibility of furnishings, potential configurations, available technologies, and equipment capabilities.

**Potential strategies and approaches**
- Incorporate information in the class scheduling database on walking time/distance to the “heart” or center of campus.
- Investigate how different course schedules of colleges or programs may be a deterrent or promote active learning pedagogies. For example, some active learning activities may benefit from more extended class periods to facilitate arrangement of the space.
- Gather information to discover why certain rooms might be more or less popular than others. Conduct data gathering in an ongoing way.
## Learning Space Rating System | Scoresheet

### Instructions

1. Review the rating system so you have a sense of the criteria for which you can receive credits.
2. Choose the spaces you wish to rate.
3. Make a copy of this spreadsheet file for each space to be rated. Name one copy for each space using the file naming convention: institution name_building_roomnumber_MMDDYYYY
4. Walk through each space and rate it according to the criteria below. Enter points into "Earned Points" column and provide a brief justification statement as to why points were earned.
5. For each room's total points on each of the six sections and rating, go to the LSR Score Summary Sheet (second tab), which is populated with the values from the earned points column, according to the weighting of sections shown.
6. Provide photos of the space labelled with similar file naming convention in the link area below (e.g., Flickr, Dropbox, FLEXspace repository) or by embedding them in the third tab on this document.

### Room Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Information</th>
<th>Type of Space Being Rated:</th>
<th>Check one:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Discussion-focused space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building:</td>
<td>Presentation-focused space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room No:</td>
<td>Team-based space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to photos:</td>
<td>Versatile space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 1. Integration with Campus Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Credit Number</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sub-criterion</th>
<th>Maximum Credits</th>
<th>Earned Credits</th>
<th>Scoring Justification Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alignment with Campus Academic Strategy</td>
<td>Provide evidence of alignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integration with Learning Space Master Plan</td>
<td>Provide evidence of alignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Compatibility with Technology Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Provide evidence of alignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTICLES

Three Billion Square Feet of Green Building Space LEED®-Certified
Campus reports
Foothill-De Anza Community College District

- Foothill College – Los Altos Hills, CA
- De Anza College – Cupertino, CA
- Public, 2-year colleges
- Serving 60,000+ students annually in and around Silicon Valley
- Highest graduation & transfer rates nationally
- Deeply dedicated to student equity
De Anza College Team-Based Space

Kirsch Center for Environmental Study, Room 113
LSRS Rating – 56.00
De Anza College Presentation-Focused Space

Media & Learning Center, Room 103
LSRS Rating – 62.00
Foothill College Discussion-Focused Space

Krause Center for Innovation, Room 4004
LSRS Rating – 59.00
Foothill College Versatile Space

Physical Science & Engineering Center, Room 4501
LSRS Rating – 57.00
Our Experience with LSRS

• System strengths
  – Relatively easy to complete
  – Standardizes metrics for evaluating space
    • Across space types
    • Across space uses
    • Across organizations within and beyond an institution
  – Provides a national benchmark for evaluating design and deployment success
  – Provide methodology to improve:
    • The design process
    • The deployment and operation process
    • The faculty development program
Our Experience with LSRS

• Opportunities for improvement
  – Terminology, concepts are very university-centric
    • Example: Registrar-controlled versus department-controlled space
    • Consider a review of LSRS by a panel of community college practitioners
  – There is still a relatively high level of vagueness in LSRS terminology
    • Example: What constitutes “innovative”
    • Some terms/concepts may need more definition or references
  – Subjective questions can be difficult to answer
    • There is not always an obvious “yes” or “no” answer
    • Answers to these questions might be more effective on a scale
  – Documentation requested by LSRS may be difficult to track down
    • The availability of documentation can affect the score of a space
Conducted evaluations of six different active learning spaces
Features state-of-the-art technology and software including a 4x2 immersive interactive touch video wall with highly interactive software (Mersive Solstice) that will allow all students to share their content and collaborate via any mobile device. Any number of users can instantly connect, share and control the display, fostering collaboration and decision-making. This classroom’s vision redefines visual displays by providing a collaborative media surface where the instructor interacts and interfaces with content shared by classroom participants.
Immersive Showcase Classroom – IUPUI University Hall
Score Summary 89

Positive
• Highly aligned with campus mission
• Highly innovative technology tools
• Adequate design for flexibility

Improvement
Better power solution for students
Need for increased utilization
Launch research focusing on this room and disseminate findings
106-seat active lecture hall classroom features student whiteboards, power to each seat, variety of grouping options and Mersive Solstice which allows students to project wirelessly to the front projectors.
Active Lecture Hall Classroom—IUPUI Hine Hall
Score Summary 86

Positive

• Power addressed – at all seats
• Highly innovative technology tools
• Interesting layout for large lecture classroom
• Leveraged additional wireless

Improvement

• Launch research focusing on this room and disseminate findings
• No ability to create transparency or views to the exterior
LE 104 is a technology-rich environment that fosters group collaboration and technology for large classes. The room design uses a central teaching station connected to a very large video wall to create a highly motivating visual experience for students.
Collaborative Learning Studio– IUPUI LE104
Score Summary 86

Positive

• Dissemination of information – high quality video at http://tinyurl.com/activeiupui
• Highly innovative technology tools
• Collaborative layout for large classes

Improvement

• Fixed tables allows for no flexible groupings
• No ability to create transparency
The Café Classroom challenges traditional assumptions about classroom design to create a learning environment that utilizes informal seating to emphasize interaction and student-centered learning. The layout and furnishings break down the traditional classroom hierarchy and enable the instructor to move freely across the room, engaging and interacting with all students. Soft furnishings, high and low bistro-style tables, a corner sofa, and booths equipped with monitors and PCs facilitate collaborative learning and group work. Five other seats along the wall provide additional computers to support group work as needed.
Collaboration Cafe– Cedar Hall IUB
Score Summary 89

Positive

• Extensive dissemination with high quality video [http://tinyurl.com/iubcafe](http://tinyurl.com/iubcafe)
• Coffeehouse as classroom: Examination of a new style of active learning environment. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2014*(137), 41-51.

Improvement

• Update technology tools to include wireless collaboration
• Add Crestron controls to share out content to student stations or visa versa
The Collaborative Learning Studio (SB 015) is an innovative classroom space that leverages advanced technologies to support collaborative learning in large classes. Students can work as teams at technology-enhanced tables and have their work displayed on a 20-foot wide video wall for sharing with the larger class. The room contains 16 six-student tables (total seating for 96 students). Each table contains a computer, large monitor, connections for three laptops, and two push-to-talk microphones. Document cameras and speakers are available for use at the student tables if activities require these technologies.
Collaboration Learning Studio - IUB
Score Summary 89

Positive

• Excellent planning process with shared buy-in and research pending publication.
• Very high utilization due to the unique innovative nature of the room
• Square footage per student (31 ft.)

Improvement

Update technology tools to include wireless collaboration
Ballantine 314 was renovated with a Learning Innovation Hub grant from Steelcase. This grant transformed the traditional 33 seat tablet armchair classroom to a flexible space using Steelcase’s Verb Tables and Node chairs. Additional features include student whiteboards at each table to create collaboration hubs and two 80” flat interactive touch panels to improve sight lines and viewing angles and provide innovative instruction.
Steelcase Verb Table Classroom- IUB
Score Summary 70

Positive

• Due to grant funding, this room has a strong evaluation plan
• Fosters collaboration through a vast amount of student whiteboards
• Upgraded technology with a new interactive monitor solution

Improvement

• Insufficient room density – 20.58 per student – need to decrease student enrollment for better flexibility in the classroom
• Future proofing with sufficient power
What stood out?
Square foot per student for type of classroom
Sufficient power for active classrooms
Access to Adjacent Informal Learning Areas
Access to Student Writing Surfaces
Flexible and Mobile Furniture
research

[plural] 1 serious study

discover new facts

research into the

student

lab

I've done some research –
Summary –
• Take findings to classroom committees
• Share with Architect’s office
• Review and develop tasks related to improvements in reviewed classrooms
• Utilize evaluation criteria when planning new and renovated spaces
Using the LSRS

for Changing the Landscape

Dr. Jennifer Spink Strickland, Center for Teaching and Learning
Paul Hickey, College Technology Services
Mesa Community College
Why LSRS

• Old infrastructure
• Transition spaces to support more flexible, active, engaged learning
• Collaborative approach to remodeling
• Strategic approach to college (future)
• Meaningful comparisons - prioritize needs
• National benchmark
LSRS Room Types

Presentation

Discussion

Team

Versatile
Presentation space: large lecture space

NU101: Nursing
Team

LS105: Life Science
Versatile
Cons

• Learning curve
• Hard to schedule with all stakeholders
• Buy-in
• Section 1 assumes different institutional plans are already in place
• Section 4 Some standards require specific knowledge (ASHRAE & ANSI)
• Some standards (environmental quality) you cannot change
Pros

• National Standards (removes the personal)
• Removes the qualitative/emotional for budgetary decisions
• Assess against several categories rather than singular focus
• Easy to use (once familiar)
• Great for leading conversation and follow through
• Informs institutional master planning if not in place
Summary data

LSRS Pilot
Demographics

- 7 schools
- 41 rooms
  - 8 Discussion type
  - 12 Presentation type
  - 7 Team type
  - 14 Versatile type
Current limitations of analysis

• Small number of rooms for analysis
• Variable methodology for schools picking rooms
• Rich factor
Discussion type space
Presentation type space
Team type space
Versatile type space
LSRS Sections

• Integration with Campus Context
• Planning Process
• Support and Operations

• Environmental Quality
• Layout and Furnishings
• Technology
Thoughts on data so far

• High variability in results, especially in
  – Integration with Campus Context
  – Planning Process

• Team based spaces have highest scores, most consistent
Discussion
Thank you!