

ETLG Monthly Meeting

September 15, 2014

In Attendance:

Jenn Stringer	UCB*
David Levin	UCD*
Paul Verwey	UCD*
Shohreh Bozorgmehri	UCI*
Todd Van Zandt	UCM*
Israel Fletes	UCR*
Larry Loehner	UCLA
Rose	UCLA*
George Michaels	UCSB*
Jim Phillips	UCSC*
Jeff Henry	UCSD*
Dan Suchy	UCSD*
Gail Persily	UCSF
Mary-Ellen Kreher	UCOE
Mike Wood	UCOE*

* = Present

Minutes

- **Roll Call** at 1:05 PM (George Michaels) - 5 minutes
- **Final Approval of "ETLG Response and Recommendations to Vendor Terms and Condition Workgroup Report"**
 - David Levin moved to approve the report in its current form, as amended by Jim Phillips during the meeting. Seconded by Israel Fletes. Motion carried unanimously.
 - Jenn will incorporate Jim's suggestion and will forward the final report to me to be forwarded to Jeff Henry, our ITLC Liaison, for distribution to the ITLC.
- **Next Steps in Having Unizen do a Presentation for the ETLG**
 - Ball in George's court to make contact
 - Separate meeting probably best. Probably not a west coast presenter. Probably will need a separate meeting. Generally an hour in length. Discuss opening meeting to other folks from our groups. Give us several weeks. Doodle Poll of ETLG membership for likely times and dates - George. Based on that poll, George will contact Unizen to arrange for a presentation targeting one of those dates.
- **ILTI Update** - Mary-Ellen Kreher (Mary-Ellen was unable to attend today).
 - Request for questions for Mary-Ellen
 - Mary-Ellen had forwarded the new RFP last Friday to everyone. David observed that there was more time this year.
 - Dan questions: Last year there was an informational meeting after proposals were due. Will there be an informational meeting scheduled for this year?

- Jen: Some thinking about a joint proposal for pool development - see agenda item below.
- Shohreh: First year that she has received information at this early stage. Is the process the same? Appreciation for Mary-Ellen for getting the information out.
- **Brainstorming Session on Possible ETLG ILTI Project - Michael Wood**
 - Should be pretty quick. Good segue. Has everyone gone through the documentation for the funding guidelines. Tools are absent this time around, could try though. Do we have a good idea for a cross-campus development project that would be helpful? Benefits for more than one campus. Rose: there are some open source gamification platforms that might be a target for a systemwide project. Shohreh, question for Michael, the funding in the current call not specifically called out. Michael: Have funded some tools projects, but do not know how successful these will be. Tools proposals left out of this call until they see how successful those tools projects already funded will be. Sort of waiting on deliverables before moving forward with a request for more. Would be good to use this to generate lessons learned that can help future projects. Michael not above making people feel uncomfortable... would be hard for the committee to ignore a joint proposal from us and a group of faculty, even if the category is not included specifically in the RFP this time around. If delayed, or ignored, then maybe we could look for other possible funding sources. Rose's call for more systemic analytics. Is there some meat there with a potential bigger bang for the buck in this area? Caliper proof of concept of mixed analytics from multiple sources. There may some hope for a proof of concept plan along these lines. Organizing ourselves is maybe more important than the funding. Jeff: wish we were closer to something on closed captioning solution. All paying for captioning, and some are using the same service - CLow24 (sic?) (UCOP, and Davis). Money toward an analysis of what makes sense? Google survey to look at captioning and transcription. Mike will help George on survey. Shohreh and Jenn need to report back on student fees survey in October.
- **Discussion about Campus Mobilization for the Educational Technology Summit**
 - UCSB ILTI Steering Committee may be addressing. Dan, heard about it, but no invites out. Merced invites out today as well. UCD a list is being developed, should expect invitations soon. UCR department got invitation for 4 seats. Tom said a total of 300 will be attending. 250 from campuses and then more presenters and vendors. Not much inward looking, a lot of external folks. Jenn, some confusion about what the goal will be. Faculty may not get a lot out of the agenda as it is currently envisioned. Not clear what the campus-level impact will be. Shohreh, not sure if we will know who from the campus will be invited, because we are not in the loop as much as we could or should have been. UCSC, not clear who is being invited. Shohreh contacted the Provost's office to get more information on Irvine's plans... told that they were sending invitations out, but no request for input from Shohreh or the CIO. Jim was asked about possible names, his boss the CIO had not been asked for suggestions. Sounds like basically one of the CIO's got the request. Seems like this is a place where we can use Tom's engagement with us to get a discussion going about how the information about these kinds of things gets disseminated. Jeff - Information went to the EVC's. Maybe it is only getting filtered out to the academic side of the house, and not the technical side as well. Maybe the CIO's can talk to their EVC's about not having been invited, short-circuiting some of the educational technology folks. Some of the faulty information flow can be due to misunderstanding how the campuses are organized. Has been somewhat confusing in the way it has been organized and information distributed. Jeff: Dan and he heard about this a couple of months ago. Shohreh - even for ILTI, did not get ILTI information in a timely manner to help faculty last year. Also begs the question about educational technology leadership on the campuses. Jim, since vendors are involved would also be good to include folks from TAS and Strategic Sourcing. Gartner (The Hypecycle for Technology in Education": "Exostructure" systems, LTI, interoperability, etc., a major component. Jeff, final comment about communication, Jeff passes information form ITLC on to ETLG very effectively.

- **Campus Update - UCLA** (Skipped, Larry not available)
- **Open Forum -**
 - What are we going to do about a task force about Analytics? We did agree that it would be a good idea, but did not actually form the group yet. This could be a very good topic for a systemwide discussion. UCSD excited and developing incrementally working with faculty. Tom would be well positioned to move it out to the systemwide level. Should be foundational to ILTI in figuring out what worked and what didn't work. Call for nominations for the task force to go out from Israel and George in the next week. Needs to also include SIS as well as CMS systems. Needs to be combined. Unizen conversation is probably the first step along this route because they are taking a more inclusive view to the architecture. ILTI Mini-Hub is probably a good target for some of this analytics data as well. The Mini-Hub had to go forward to show proof of productive and useful project early on. Jeff: in addition to the data, is the privacy issue, and how faculty will actually use the information, and how can we train and support faculty in using it to good purpose. Rose sat in on a privacy discussion and they liked the notion of a students' bill of rights and what that should look like. Getting that awareness into the standards so that the ownership of the data resides with the students, and not the institution or the faculty. Does your data evaporate when you leave or do you want to "donate it to science"? The research conversation at Berkeley has upstaged the whole conversation about the actual information and how it can be used by faculty and students. This is a way to convert the relevancy of educational research to the campus. UC Engage agenda is a student learning session on big data by and outside presenter. If we had a task force by then, we could be organized to address the presentations.
 - Jim looking forward to an agreement with Adobe on Creative Cloud. TAS reps on campuses are working on that, as well as other third party tools. AT UCSC impact is in the computer labs because of changing licensing and node locks for control, much more emphasis on licensing tied to the individual rather than the institution. Impact currently in real labs, and not so much in virtual labs yet, but that is probably coming as well. Apple did something similar, but their software is much more affordable than the products from Adobe and SPSS for example. Very similar to the squeeze that the Libraries are undergoing for subscriptions. UCB also in negotiations along these lines, and students are going to realize that they are going to end up spending a lot of money for suites for which they only use one or two applications. Microsoft products will also be affected by these changes. Todd indicates similar situation at Merced. Perhaps Jenn and Shohreh can also address this as part of their presentation on student tech fees. Those fees could just get completely eaten by the vendors, and leave nothing else for campus educational technology. Even those products that are "in the cloud" does not really work very well or simply for the end users.
- **Meeting Adjourned at 2:23 PM.**