

MEETING NOTES

UC IT GUIDANCE COMMITTEE Instructional Technology Work Group

April 21, 2006, 9 am – 3 pm
UC Office of the President, Oakland

Members present: Dickens, Edmonds, Matkin, McDowell, McGrath, Michaels, Murphy, Parker, Sabean (chair), Souza, Wienhausen

Members absent: Gorham

ITGC Members present: Greenstein, Hafner (for lunch only)

Administrative Staff: Scott-Noennig

Introduction & Overview

After brief introductions, AVP Greenstein provided an overview of the IT Guidance Committee and an update from the ITGC's inaugural meeting on April 14. He presented a PowerPoint overview (select *ITGC Overview* on <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/itgc/supdocs/welcome.html>) and context for the ITGC (select *IT Guidance Committee: Planning Strategically, Breaking New Ground* on <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/itgc/meetings/welcome.html>). He characterized the April 14 meeting participants as very engaged, recognizing the importance of the project and its timeliness. The committee resolved that the case must be made that IT investments should be recognized as investments in infrastructure. Given the amount of money already spent across all the campuses for hardware and software, systemwide investment could mean substantial leverage with vendors – and, should the campuses subscribe to systemwide standards and frameworks for sharing information -- opportunities for research collaboration would be considerably enhanced. Indeed, Greenstein cited a recent issue of *Nature* where the case was made that research innovation can no longer be divorced from IT.

Greenstein mentioned that some of the work groups described in the PowerPoint (such as IT in Student Life) might actually be organized instead as “flash mobs” or “guerrilla” groups that meet in bursts to surface focus areas and strategic directions because they do not warrant constituting a work group for 12-18 months.

Greenstein mentioned that one of the big ideas put forth at the ITGC meeting (by UCLA's Jim Davis) was to “invert UC's IP paradigm”. A discussion about UC's intellectual property and patent policies ensued. Edmonds and Sabean informed Greenstein that their campuses' participation in Sakai is in jeopardy because the UC Office of General Counsel (OGC) will not let them sign the Apache license for contributing code (Berkeley is a major contributor to the project and UCLA is providing code as well). Edmonds said that the OGC has suggested that Berkeley drop out of the Sakai project. He also said that UC policies make it “very challenging” to form partnerships, such as the ones Berkeley currently has with Apple and Google. Greenstein (and later Hafner, when the discussion was brought up again during her lunchtime visit) said that they would help facilitate a resolution to the Sakai problem and suggested that Steve Benedict (Director IT Strategic Sourcing) could be helpful. Greenstein mentioned that Samuela Evens in the Research Administration Office and Chuck Rzeszutko in Office of Technology Transfer helped out with a similar agreement for the CDL in the past. There was consensus, as Hafner put it, that “we need to reeducate the university because their position is based on past history”.

Greenstein mentioned that the “deliverable” from the ITGC would be a brief document that recommends strategic directions for the University. In response to Sabean's question about whether the current timetable was relevant, Greenstein responded “yes”.

McDowell asked if IT would in the future come out of different sources than the operating budget, as is the case with buildings.

Brainstorming Exercise

Sabean called the Work Group's attention to a visioning document that included recommendations from the Boyer commission and the National Academy of Sciences. She also mentioned the work of Derek Bok, former Harvard president who in a recent book wrote that colleges and universities are not doing what they need to do. Sabean posed the question: What can a research university really offer undergraduates? Perhaps it's time they stop behaving like they are bigger versions of liberal arts colleges.

Sabean asked each member to suggest issues or visions of the future (went around the table twice). Topics/suggestions mentioned were:

- Using existing IT creatively for Teaching & Learning
- Defining new literacies: information, IT, visual, etc.
- Strategy for moving from the experimental stage to the accountability stage (in terms of IT's impact on Teaching & Learning)
- Improving collaboration within and across UC campuses
- Developing a common vision for UC in the form of a UC-wide vision statement outlining minimum standards for instructional technology and pedagogical implementation
- Thinking interdisciplinary: changing who's at the table; collaboration as necessary to recognize existing synergies
- Transforming Teaching & Learning with technology
- Creating a new vocabulary
- Changing focus to incorporate technology in Teaching & Learning instead of on supplying new technologies
- Defining/adopting minimum standards/requirements (e.g., laptops) to help take advantage of IT
- Who owns course content? Technology is a driver (e.g., web archiving software that captures everything that happens in class).
- Promotion, reward & tenure: how will use of educational technology play into it?
- Promotion, reward & tenure: our practices and policies fly in the face of collaboration
- Future of textbooks
- Improving user-facing systems (access to content needs to be more seamless to students); students are going to commercial space to get what they want; disconnect between what we're providing and where students go to get content
- Managing information that's part of the research enterprise and integrating it into Teaching & Learning (benefit of being at a research university is that the formation of knowledge can be brought directly into instruction). This is too hard right now to do.
- Decision makers (academic and legislative) aren't often aware of what we're doing with IT
- Rethinking education in the 21st Century (need to educate students in the skills to make sense of data)
- How do we get IT and academic discussions to intersect?
- Generational differences: how to get our faculty up-to-date on technology
- Control (the dynamic is changing): technology allows students and other users to disaggregate the universe that we carefully create for them and they reassemble it for themselves (e.g., students go to Google first instead of the web pages that UC libraries have created for them).
- Repository for sharing learning objects, instructional materials (sharing info in a useful way that is embedded in the community of users)
- Social networking software and virtual communities
- Large lecture courses: What is worth keeping from the traditional model and what can we learn about new teaching approaches?
- Multi-tasking students for whom use of personal information technology competes with the "sage on the stage" for their attention
- Lifelong learning/lifecycle of constituents: from K-12 through alumni through 99

- Student outcomes and assessment: how to take advantage of IT to help instructors integrate assessment throughout the course, focusing on desired learning outcomes
- Similarities and differences among disciplines – is this significant?

Sabean asked the WG members what trends they think may impact instructional technology over the next ten years.

- Student enrollment
- Moore's law and the rapid pace of technology change
- Open source software
- Video convergence
- Attack on fair use
- Accountability (students, parents, legislature, etc. want to know where the money goes)
- Putting a monetary value on education
- Generation gap and IT
- Partnerships (potential and obstacles)
- Ethics of IT (for example, plagiarism)
- How will university quality be evaluated? For example, what evidence will be required of graduating students' knowledge and skills?
- Education as a commodity and lifelong resource; Education moving from "investment" to "commodity"
- Political support base
- Online communities and university's responsibility in students' participation in them
- Growth of personal technologies
- Changing funding models for education
- Competition with for-profit universities
- Competition for academic services (e.g., Google Scholar)
- UC is a leader, whether we want to be or not; power to influence the nation
- Idea of the university is changing (students integrate university into their lives, not their lives into the university)
- Increased involvement of parents
- Need for lifelong learning to stay current with job skills
- Expansion of summer sessions and more porous borders between campuses/institutions
- Diversity (leveraging it)

The WG then participated in a scenario exercise and came up with some dichotomies in which the trends could be grouped:

- Control: individual (student) <--> formal organization (university)
- Format: online <--> face/residential
- Money: fragmented/decentralized <--> centralized
- Competition: multi-provider <--> dominant provider
- Change: stable <--> innovation
- Value: competencies <--> degree
- Accountability: job oriented <--> liberal arts/citizen of the future
- Lifecycle: 4 year <--> 40 year

These dichotomies were considered for assignment to two axes (cross) in order to surface various perspectives and possibilities. The group brainstormed by putting the lifecycle and control dichotomies on the two axes.

Demo of Confluence Work Group site

Murphy demonstrated the Confluence site that she has created for the Work Group. Members were supportive of using this wiki software to facilitate the group's work. Murphy indicated that the site is currently in development but should be migrated to a production environment soon, at which time she will distributed login identities and passwords.

Decisions and action items:

- Make the default setting of the space restricted to the WG members
- Make specific documents viewable by the public as appropriate
- Create a sandbox page on the site so members can experiment with the software
- Add a link to Confluence's help section

Members asked how the information on Confluence will be shared with other work groups and the ITGC. Sabean suggested that the issue be put in the "parking lot" for future discussion.

Inside UC

Sabean and Murphy identified common issues among the campus IT plans that the Work Group members had submitted prior to the meeting. They include:

- Data
- Hardware
- Software
- Services
- Centers of innovation
- Lower division courses
- Principles/vision
- Pedagogy/learning
- Organizational structure
- Faculty promotion, tenure & reward
- Best practices
- Role of libraries

Recommendation and action items: Matkin suggested that the Work Group members identify on their campuses those units engaged in instructional technology and to identify "institutional expressions of IT" to get a representative listing on each campus of who's doing what, what their concerns are, what's coming up in the future, etc. Edmonds seconded this idea.

External influences

Sabean asked the Work Group members to identify external factors, such as emerging technology catalysts:

- Open educational resources (e.g., OpenCourseWare)
- Classroom environment (making it flexible to increase student engagement)
- Other sectors of education probably have something to teach us (e.g., K-12, community colleges, for-profits, privates)
- Implementation models for the emerging technologies
- Next generation students and faculty
- New ways of handling content management and learning objects
- University centers (for example, those that focus on innovation, teaching and learning)
- Instructional design models that work
- How to integrate libraries in instruction
- How to push out content. Where does learning take place? (it was suggested that the least amount of student "learning time" is spent in the physical classroom)

Work Group Process:

- Recommendation: Matkin suggested that each member nominate three areas where they think the Work Group's focus areas should be and that the group go back to them continually as it collects data
- Decision: Sabean polled whether weekly assignments were appropriate for the group and requested that they respond using the gradient of consensus that was included in the agenda. They agreed that weekly assignments were ok, with some members expressing their desire that those assignments be directly relevant to the Work Group's charge.
- Decision: Sabean asked if Wednesdays are a good due date and the members said "yes".
- Recommendation: Greenstein stated the Work Group's end product will be nominations for strategic directions with an explanation for why the issues are important. He said the "why" will be very important.
- Action item: Greenstein also indicated that other work groups will want to conduct faculty surveys, focus groups, or other information-gathering activities and that the work groups should collaborate on joint vehicles to be administered by late Fall 2006.
- Action Item: Dickens asked that the Work Group be alerted when the ITGC April 14 meeting notes are made available. Greenstein suggested that the ITGC planning group create a vehicle for providing updates to Work Group members and others who are interested in getting updates.

Sabean asked the Work Group members for their ideas on how meetings could be structured in the future. Matkin suggested that the outcomes for the meeting be clearly stated and adhered to so people can come prepared. The Work Group reviewed the outcomes on the meeting agenda and identified gaps.

- Action Item: Matkin suggested that we put on Confluence a resources/reference library of information and sources for the domains that the group identifies.

###

Break out of Action Items, Decisions, Suggestions & Resources

Action items:

1. Greenstein and Hafner to follow up with Research Administration Office, Office of Technology Transfer on UC policy that presents barriers to open source software collaboration by UC staff. For example, the Apache Contributors License for contributing code to Sakai.
2. Sabean to provide document describing Sakai/Apache licensing issues Hafner and Greenstein (completed)
3. Work Group to put together consultation plan for possible presentation at the June ITGC meeting
4. Add a resource/reference library to the Confluence site for collecting information on the domains that the Work Group identifies (completed)
5. Collaborate with other work groups/flash mobs on joint information collection vehicles (for faculty, students, etc.) to be administered by late Fall 2006.
6. Alert Work Group when ITGC April 14 meeting minutes are published.

Decisions:

1. The Work Group will attempt to complete much of its work online, via a combination of listserv and the Confluence wiki.
2. The default access setting for Confluence will be closed but individual pages will be made publicly viewable as deemed appropriate.
3. The Work Group was in consensus that short weekly assignments, due on Wednesdays, was a feasible workflow approach.

Suggestions, Recommendations and Parking Lot Issues:

1. Explore with ITGC leadership how Confluence might be used for sharing information across various ITGC groups.
2. Create a sandbox page on the Confluence site so members can experiment with the software (*completed*)
3. Add a link to Confluence's help section (*completed*)
4. Prior to meetings, clearly outline meeting goals on the agenda
5. Articulate relevance of individual Work Group assignments to the Work Group's goals
6. Ask each Work Group member to nominate three areas where they think the Work Group's focus areas should be and that the group go back to them continually as it collects data