

ETLG Monthly Meeting

February 2, 2015

In Attendance:

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

* = Present

Minutes

- Roll call at 1:05 PM (George Michaels) - 5 minutes
- Review of Minutes from January 12 Meeting
- Unizin Face to Face Meeting Followup
 - Options for moving forward, a system seat and additional campuses coming on board. Two options. All systems are treated the same, an entity joins as part of a system. After that each additional site can come on for \$100,000 sponsored by the initial member. So, UCOP could join, and then would have one seat on the board. Santa Cruz could join with UCOP sponsorship for \$100,000. Each founding member can send two people to board meetings, but they only have one vote. Could have our own internal governance process as folks join. The fee is \$100,000 total, for the initial three year period. Not clear whether the 100,000 has to be paid up front or can be split over the three years. Members would license Canvas from Unizin, rather than through NetPlus as you do now. You can pilot with Canvas without committing. How big a pilot can you do for free, and for how long? Good questions that we did not ask but we can find out. Do we know the long term costs after the three years. They don't know yet, in part they don't know how big they might get by the end of the three years. It is a risk, because it may not make it to the three years. The Canvas licenses might have to be renegotiated at the end of the three years in any event. In part, some of their uncertainty is due to not knowing how quickly they will

grow. There is a possible 15-20 member cap for the board initially. One other thing that Jenn heard from Tom after the meeting, if the ETLG recommends joining to the ITLC, then he will handle the initial part of the funding from UCOP. Key piece for Jenn from Berkeley, would need sponsorship at the executive level from the Undergraduate instruction side. David seconds that idea, that the T&L folks on campus also need to buy off on the idea. This can't be something that only the CIOs are deciding. Mary-Ellen has been talking to Provost Doerr about the possibilities for pilot potential, academically what the needs are across the campuses as a consortial approach. On the campuses, movement to discuss this from the academic side. Jeff, this is a great vision, but not necessarily one that we need to pay to share. What if we took the money that we might invest in this and pooled it for internal development. Jenn: This brings engagement outside the UC system that may be productive, and may be a good investment for being able to deal with the tools vendors and textbook publishers. Also a way to maintain ownership of the student analytic data, for which we are the stewards. Rose, we struggled with this question since it is a good vision, but Unizin may not be the best way to accomplish those things. Jeff agrees with all of those concerns, but still wonders if we can invest ourselves as a system. Berkeley is definitely interested in the analytics element, and ready to make the right investments in collecting and managing that data. Mary-Ellen, one of the challenges is "how we would sit at the table" with the Unizin board, but found it compelling that the board has a shared vision that is firmly couched in the teaching and learning space. There was mention in the notes that there is no solution yet in terms of the data repository. Unizin will provide the relays, but not the repository. Moodle for example can work with Equella, and for UCLA that was going to cost about 1 million per year. It also would help to have the vendors write one routine to feed the data to a single systemwide repository. For now, most of us are not going to be running a lot of detailed analytics against our LMSs. This is about the relationships between the transactional elements that are part of what students are doing while in residence on our campuses. Penn, the benefit to Unizin could be just helping us to focus on solving these problems as a system. David, we may see and share this vision, but at Davis his concern is that lots of the other players on his campus are not yet in the loop, and do not have any sense of the vision. Dan agrees with that. We are kind of hoping that Unizin will help pull us all to a common vision. Penn suggests that we, the ETLG share a vision, and we need to be able to sell that vision. If we don't see ourselves as the movers and shakers on our campuses, will not help. David, the issue is not the money, but what the expectations of participation in Unizin, and can we commit to meeting those? One area that might be productive would be the notion of a UC governance structure, prompted by the needs for coordinating on participating in Unizin. ILTI is the first toe in the water within the system toward addressing internal educational missions in a systemwide way. Mary-Ellen, we may not need to be able to pull all of the data into one location and then split it out by campus. The campus institutional research groups already do some of this. Jeff: perhaps we need to put together a fairly concise argument that explicates the vision and how that can help. On our campuses all of us have to work hand in hand with lead faculty in order to help effect change. David, I like what you said about the need for a concise document that could articulate the vision and make the arguments for why participation together makes sense. Articulate the vision, and then Unizin could be one of the options. Several of the group going to ELI. Perhaps could start. Proposal to draft a document quickly as a small group activity. Jim, a question about repositories for faculty content. Use case of having to change your LMS, the Unizin model could make this much easier. Unizin is almost a proof concept for how to put all of these standards complaint element together at scale... can it actually work? Unizin's folks are building APIs, nit software. Jeff so sold on IMS because the standards for interoperability is a winner for everyone. Resolved that we will work on a short document. Focus on the students.

- Result of ETLG email, calendaring, and document collaboration survey survey - Dan Suchy

- <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1H0MYLNbTpnhsVpB7IfVzfANZMIXUUZePnzwpwHgnw8/viewform>

Thanks to everyone for participating. AT UCSD have several different systems for dealing with all of these functions, and are looking at trying to have a single system for at least student email, calendaring and collaboration tools. Themes, each campus is more homogeneous than Dan though. Did not realize the widespread use of Google Apps formally and informally across the system. Google Apps and Box were the big ones for storage. For calendaring everyone is all over the place and no one is happy. Todd, when Merced went through this process several years ago, there are still folks on his campus who wonder if the grass is greener on the other side. Question can you run Google Apps without the email component. Dan, we did this just to inventory. Will deal with further questions via email.

- UC Camtasia contract offer - David Levin

Conversations will two different representatives at Camtasia. See document that David shared via email. Getting slightly different terms from the second rep. willing to talk further with him. License for faculty and staff to download and install on all of their official machines, in addition allows downloads to all institutionally owned machines. Counter was for a 25% annual maintenance fee, in addition to the one time fee for three years. Drop me an email to let me know if you want to pursue it.

- Update on Possible Systemwide Piazza Licensing - Gabe Youtsey

CIO of ANR, formerly at Davis. Co-Chair of the Cloud Services working Group of ITLC. Google Apps, Box, Salesforce. Working on a survey with TAS to find out what the campuses need beyond productivity and pushing into the academic space. Piazza will be made available on a OP website. Systemwide procurement conference, there are lots of challenges. Piazza landed on Gabe's desk as a tool to look at... the "loudest voice" process at work! Free contract, very Googlesque in that way, but hopefully not as difficult as Google Apps was. Have a group formed to review the current license terms and will eventually bring on a security person to look at data security issues. Penn - just finished having a security review for TurnItIn, and got some interesting concessions out of TurnItIn. Part of this would be getting a provision to be able to get student analytics out of Piazza. Probably currently not part of what Piazza provides, so this would be an additional ask. ETLG should have a representative to this group. Just need to let Gabe know who — Jenn will be the representative to the Piazza Working Group. ITLC will want to append several elements about accessibility and security to the contract language. Did some barnstorming on other academic technologies. George sent Gabe the ETLG Third Party Tool survey. Should have Gabe on a call every couple of months.

- Adjourned 2:39 PM