

ETLG Monthly Meeting

October 6, 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 Rocchio	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
- Review of Minutes from September 15 Meeting
Jenn Suggestion - call out action items in the minutes to add to the next meeting so we can follow up on them. Rose question - Call of Learning Analytics Task Force, did call go out? No, but George will follow up [**ACTION ITEM - George**].
- Third Party Tools Survey Discussion - Shohreh Bozorgmehri
Had a conversation about third party tools at Irvine within group, with CIO and with their Extension. Wants to gather some information on what third party tools are being used, either licensed, or unlicensed. Wants to collect a base line for commonalities between the campuses, for our own information and to inform ITLC, as well as to look at possible systemwide licensing. Berkeley did an informal survey of their campus, but a bigger survey would be much more helpful. Would also be good to know at what stage each campus might be in terms of their use of each of these tools and the models for supporting them. Some campuses may be further along in their use of some tools. Also would be good to include costs associated with each at the campuses as well. Will this result in UCI going forward with a proposal to ITLC? Probably not, but rather possible information to TAS for those items for which it might make sense to negotiate a systemwide license. UCI's CIO interested in understanding what the state of play in this domain is at a systemwide level. Piazza, for example is already licensed systemwide. Want to get a handle on what are the most commonly used tools. This will also help with elements of our recommendations that we made on the "Click-through" licensing

task force. Mike has a spreadsheet for the tools that UCOE is currently using as well as specific information about each one, and some have an indication of FERPA compliance, but that is locally determined. Jenn - Mike can you share that spreadsheet with the rest of us as a starting point? Answer is Yes [ACTION ITEM - Mike]. May save some time and effort if UCOE legal has already cleared some of the tools. Perhaps Shohreh, Jenn and David can take Mike's spreadsheet and then up date for everyone. [ACTION ITEM - Mike, Shohreh, Jenn, David]

- Proposed demo of a competency based Learning LTI Tool - Rose Rocchio
Educause a couple of themes popped out, and Rose did some investigation on what Unizen might be proposing in this space to see what else is out there. There is a competency based tool called Difference Engine that is LTI compliant. They would be willing to do a demo for the group via webinar if we are interested. May also work well for some staff training issues as well. Might not work for a regular conference call, but might need a special session for time. Is there interest in looking at this. David also talked with them and found it interesting, thinks it is worth looking more deeply into. MaryEllen also thought that there is some very interesting potential there, especially for more self paced learning. Todd is interested, but if longer than 15-20 minutes it should be its own meeting. IM STEM group is also using some sort of adaptive learning engine as well, based on Carnegie-Mellon's initiative. Also had a pretty good TA training module that was quite effective. Take the 2-2:30 slot of the next meeting [ACTION ITEM - George]. Rose can you send us information on this in advance? [ACTION ITEM - Rose].
- Discussion of Student Tech Fee Survey Results - Jenn Stringer
Less than half of the campuses actually have a student tech fee. Hard to determine what net income per year actually is. Interesting that not all campuses felt that they and to put it to a student vote. AT UCB the initiative was really pushed by the students to maintain licenses for Office and Adobe. David: what is the governance structure behind these? Some had a special governance structure, but most piggy-back off current student fee governance. UCLA just switched to a flat fee, rather than a variable fee, may result in a decline in income. Some discussion at UCLA on possibly applying to Grad students as well. Jenn will followup to update the sheet with baseline amounts [ACTION ITEM - Jenn]
- Educause Connect Conference - Possible ETLG Presentation on Analytics - Jim Phillips
Jim asked to participate in a vendor presentation at the conference. The session is on learning analytics, Jim wanted to know if anyone wants to either join him on the presentation, or contribute information on the use of analytics on their campus. Jim can send abstract of the session to the whole ETLG [ACTION ITEM - Jim]. A natural coalition would be our task force on analytics after we get it formed. How much do faculty take advantage of analytics information. Lots of people are trying to figure out that problem space. If Steve can handle another task he would be very helpful to the task force. UCSC still running on a couple of different CMS's so there is some fragmentation and proliferation. January is right around the corner so we need to get moving on this. Dan would be interested in participating at the conference because he will be there.
- ILTI/UCOE Update - Mary-Ellen Kreher
Out most of last week for Educause. In catchup mode. The hub team is in business requirements phase. Keith Williams sent a letter to ask about elements of education policy at the campuses specifically in relation to eligibility requirements between cap uses. That has been analyzed and is now waiting for Provost's approval. No reason to change any local or campus level requirements to enforce standardization, so it will be incumbent on the Hub to determine the rules for the student's home campus and make determinations about applicability. E.g. most campuses have a 12 unit's completed on home campus rule before students can enroll online. Second area was interviewing all of the Registrars about workflow at the campus level in terms of advising and review of student enrollments to build a workflow for the HIB that will work for the campuses. MaryEllen to post that work for us. Third, work of a ITLC task force to look at identity management that can work for students across campuses, and how that can work through Shibboleth to effectively share student

information between campuses. Does the HUB have the business case for a universal systemwide student id? The Hub may not have the volume to justify that step, especially compared to the application process volume. There could be some substantial advantages to it, but it would require a highly variable amount of work on all of the campuses to implement. Not too much a view into LMS, but really SIS focused. The ID Management Group will finalize this week and will send report and recommendations to the ITLC and the Hub group. Next for the Hub depends on how these three research efforts all fall out and fall together. All will be going to ILTI steering committee.

RFP 3 is out, and hopeful that more faculty show up. Dan, UCSD will be having their own ACMS presentation to faculty on ILTI. The requirement for online only may cut into the interest for some faculty. There is some concern that the high enrollment gateway courses not being represented in current offerings. Update on the mini-Hub, new feature being developed since May which is a user interface to review student registrations for students on their home campuses. Registrars very enthusiastic about. Will roll as standard on November 10th. MaryEllen happy to do a demo of the registrar's tool at the next meeting **[ACTION ITEM - George, Mary-Ellen]**. Can the Q&A sheet be made available to the ETLG as well as the IDFS to help clarify questions that will come from faculty related to RFP3 stipulations.

- Campus Update - UCB - Jenn Stringer

Will not go through the whole slide deck. Will focus on Canvas transition, update on CalCentral, LSRS, and finally the peer benchmarking project.

Refer to slide deck posted on one for specific points and background information. One key element is that although they have high adoption of BSpace, but very shallow usage of the fill tool set available. Should be completely converted to Canvas by spring 2015, although may have to have an exception for high enrollment courses. "House-call" program to aid with conversion of course sites.

Intentionally decided not to try to just migrate the data from one system to another, primarily because there are no migration tools to make that possible. Decided that it would cost less to hire students to help faculty just move their data. The Common Cartridge tool did not work well at all to get data out of Sakai. Have put a lot of effort into encouraging faculty to build sites much earlier. Faculty not getting a good experience from Instructure's support model for their 24/7 support.

The shift to a notification system in Canvas really threw faculty for a loop. Ended up being a very large shift from the traditional email-based notification system. Lots of faculty distrust that the word is really getting out to students. Questions about code contributions from UCB to Instructure for Canvas. Jim wondering about the issues with managing large courses - real performance hits if you have a large number of students, especially the grade book. Jenn will post the pain points document **[ACTION ITEM - Jenn]**.

More information on the Contacts and Reference Info slide (17)

CalCentral Portal Project - not using PeopleSoft for SIS portal, Jenn handing over 5 developers for the SIS portal integration with CalCentral.

Learning Space Rating System - A scoring system that came out of EDUCAUSE. Aimed at how well the space supports active learning (see examples). Scores out of 100. Need a multi-disciplinary team to rate the space. Not faculty driven, but rating by professionals. Could have teams to rate other spaces at other campuses.

Peer Benchmarking work that started fall of last year. Stolen from NYU project when Jenn was there. Found it incredibly useful. Large group of 40 people from across campus. Jenn will send a link to the

Benchmarking steps document [**ACTION ITEM - Jenn**]. Each area took 4-6 hours to benchmark. The rankings of the peer institutions is based on research on each peer. See example summary sheet in slide 42. Reaction to the REA - All very impressed. Also great that each campus gets to define their own criteria. Jenn happy to share information on this process. Did a 4 hour workshop on how to do this. The process also resulted in much improved cross-collaboration between IT support groups on campus as well.

- Plan to form a workgroup around Learning Analytics - Rose Rocchio
Dealt with earlier in meeting.
- Open Forum - No time.
- **Meeting Adjourned at 2:40 PM.**