ETLG Survey 2013

Poll Description:

Healthy organizations constantly reinvent themselves to meet the dynamic needs of their constituents and customers. Given that, how can ETLG refine its strategic goals, its mission, and what suggestions can we give ITLC regarding the ETLG Charge? The questions below are intended to help ETLG examine what it wants to do and become in the future. In preparation for a discussion to take place at our annual meeting, please review our current charge on the ETLG Wiki. You will notice on the bottom of page 1 (or top of page 2) of our current charge that there are five bullet points that define our mission, listed here: 1) Provide analysis on educational technology... 2) Identify and make recommendations on promising emerging technologies... 3) Promote cross-UC campus communications... 4) Investigate various methodologies and instruments for the analysis of the effectiveness of technologies… 5) Build a sense of community and collaboration… across our 10 campuses.

Question 1:

Do you feel that the five bullet points from our charge, listed above, are still pertinent?

8	A)	Yes
2	B)	No

Question 2:

Which one of the following aspects of our ETLG charge are we actually doing and should continue to do? (multiple choice)

2	A)	Provide analysis on educational technology...
3	B)	Identify and make recommendations on promising emerging technologies
10	C)	Promote cross-UC campus communications...
2	D)	Investigate various methodologies and instruments for the analysis of the effectiveness of technologies…
8	E)	Build a sense of community and collaboration… across our campuses.

Question 3:

Which of the following are we not actively doing but should be? (multiple choice)

5	A)	Provide analysis on educational technology...
4	B)	Identify and make recommendations on promising emerging technologies...
1	C)	Promote cross-UC campus communications...
5	D)	Investigate various methodologies and instruments for the analysis of the effectiveness of technologies…
2	E)	Build a sense of community and collaboration… across our campuses.

Question 4:

Which of the following should we drop entirely or change?

3	A)	Provide analysis on educational technology...
3	B)	Identify and make recommendations on promising emerging technologies...
0	C)	Promote cross-UC campus communications...
3	D)	Investigate various methodologies and instruments for the analysis of the effectiveness of technologies…
0	E)	Build a sense of community and collaboration… across our campuses.

Question 5:

Please describe changes (if any) / other comments on our current charge

Is there any implied oversight of the UCOE project? Should that relationship be better defined?

The charge is overly idealistic and makes the mistake of assuming that all campuses should use the same technology in the same ways.

More focus on finding areas of collaboration. Ensure that ETLG has a strategic role. In addition to reporting to the CIOs it might be good to have a reporting line to the vice provosts for undergraduate education or directly to the provosts.

If we report to ITLC, they should be part of this discussion to reaffirm/suggest changes to the charge. To be effective we need their buy-in, to listen when we establish recommendations, and to seek us out when relevant.

Question 6:

Should ETLG have a new charge exclusively to share and collaborate on topics of common interest?

5	A)	Yes
5	B)	No

Question 7:

What obstacles to this new charge do you foresee?

Too Broad. This sub group should stick to Educational Technology

This would not fulfill the broader UC wide charge of working smarter

I don't see where we are unable to already do this. Collaboration is not appropriate as a charge unless it is voluntary - it can't be mandated.

I don't understand question #6

Does ITLC think we should be doing more?

Workloads/lack of time, difficulty collaborating when different campus' have different purchasing systems, functional requirements, infrastructure, etc.

Seems like the current charge 'build a send of community and collaboration' already supports the collaboration on topics of common interest.

Question 8:

Please add other comments you would like to make regarding ways to make ETLG more effective?

I think that workgroups should be taskforces instead, and have well defined scopes as well as less than a year time commitments

Tie work groups and agendas directly to our charge. Define the charge operationally.

Reduce representation on ETLG to actual service providers. Have others participate via work groups or as occasional invited guests - not as standing members.

Let's discuss this in the face to face

work towards establishing common standards, identify areas to build efficiencies (and potentially cost savings) across the campus'

Question 9:

After four years of existence, what pain points are we sensing?

Smaller working groups and report backs

Our role with regard to UCOE, analyzing its success, its strategic direction, is unclear at best.

ability to organize around work groups or projects

The agenda has been diverted either through the inability to speak openly, or because of an undue focus on narrow agendas. Without open communication, we are lost.

Lack of clear focus. Too much work-group overhead. We must recognize that the campuses are not represented evenly. Representation spans the range from technology only, instructional-design /pedagogy focused.

Finding meaningful areas of collaboration and analysis. The diversity of our organizations and where within our institutions we report.

People are very busy and don't have time to devote to efforts that may not amount to much.

After many lean years and budget cuts, there are not as many

Limited participation

Question 10:

How can we promote broader volunteerism across ETLG?

Perhaps by producing more visibile outcomes like white papers or at least written recommendations

Short sprint projects, accountability, rotating roles, joint presentations, more technology demos, webinars etc.

allow individual contributions rather than trying to force groups to meet and complete projects--time and access to each other

I think the workgroups play a good role, though they are uneven. We need to encourage them.

If the individual campuses or work groups recognize the value of the ETLG, I think that will increase participation. What can we do to make the ETLG more relevant?

Ensure that our task groups have more focused projects.

Tough one. People volunteer when the project is about something that will help them with their own job - has to be somewhat self serving.

Question 11:

What factors are at play (workload, control, etc.) and can we resolve?

It's hard to tell when people are just asked on a call what they can volunteer for. If folks aren't prepared to work then maybe a different representive should be appointed.

workload is the largest factor

workload, location - distance

Communication has been transformed into a list of items to be accomplished. This was not the original

intent.

Stop standing workgroups.

Lack of focus in some of the work of the work groups.

Workload of course. But I think there is a lack of urgency and accountability. I feel, at least, that there is no one but us who is cares if we get any work done or not. So we need to figure out things to do that we care about.

workload, budget cuts.

Question 12:

What is a reasonable time commitment for members to devote to ETLG? (2 hours per month, 4 hours, whatever we can spare)?

1-2 Hours per month or more if a workgroup is formulated and it's workload is better scoped.

2 hours

2-4 hours per month

One to two hours per month.

Varies. 2 hours at minimum.

2-5 hours per month

2 hrs month seems like the minimum to make something happen - to communicate and also read/respond to something in between.

4 hours/mo, whatever we can spare

Whatever can be spared. Some topics will be of direct benefit to folks so they may be willing to invest more time.

Question 13:

If compensation or some other incentive cannot be made available, what other ideas do you have that might promote more engagement?

Buy-in from members supervisiors, CIO's etc.

accountability and recognition , MVP style etc

create a topic of study for each to contribute to monthly

Compensation is a terrible idea. The ETLG goes off track whenever compensation or personal advancement become part of the agenda. We need to clean house on this.

See #10

All I can think of is to pick projects that we have a real stake in.

more collaborative efforts and consistency in approaches across the UCs could mean that workload may reduce on certain projects. (e.g. you only had to take the lead on one project, but in the end three were delivered)

Question 14:

Are we communicating effectively with our workgroups? Please suggest ways to improve...

What workgroups?

I think that the liason representation works well, however, I don't know that enough impact is being made workgroups i've been associated with have not convened in 9 months, so no

Somewhat. It requires a different kind of discussion than we have had. It is hard to discuss openly when

members of the workgroup are present at the discussion.

Let's discuss in the face to face

Some seem to be working well. Others seem unclear about their charge.

Probably not. Establish a couple of defined goals/objectives for the year for each group.

Yes

Question 15:

Are we communicating effectively with the ITLC? Please suggest ways to improve...

Perhaps a regular subgroup phone call and/or designated rep from each side who would carry an ongoing dialog

Perhaps a quarterly report on whats new in ET

probably not ... what do they want us to communicate ... should be clear and regular reports ... templatize the reports

I don't feel that the ITLC is my primary concern - not even in my top ten. I think a charge letter is okay, but it needs to conform to our needs, not so much their needs.

Yes

I think our chair and liaison are doing a good job with this.

Don't know what to say about this. I feel very removed from ITLC and like they don't know we exist, but that is probably not an accurate perception.

I don't know, haven't been on the group. Possibly invite a representative to our meeting to get their insight and ask how we can better serve them as a Leadership committee.

Yes

Question 16:

Should we convert the workgroups from "service-focused" to "project-focused" instead? For instance, should we establish an eTexts workgroup for one year instead of having an instructional platforms workgroup that exists over the long term?

| 8 | A) | Yes |
| 1 | B) | No |

Question 17:

What is a reasonable time commitment for workgroup members to devote to their workgroup meetings / duties?

3	A)	One hour per month?
6	B)	Two hours per month?
1	C)	Whatever they can spare?

Question 18:

Please add any additional comments on workgroups below:

They need some clear goals to accomplish

More focused, shorter time frames, tangible deliverables, presentation at UCCSC or other conference as outcome

Needs more than a survey to resolve.

Workgroups that are project based seem like a good idea. More focused goals and people can work on something until it is finished and then move on, so it is not a never-ending commitment.

the few workgroup discussions/conf calls that i've been a part of have been very useful, everyone is excited/interested, willing to share ideas, but as soon as the call is done, the collarboration stops, people dont follow-up. Normal work takes over.

Chair should be a 1 year appointment, not multi-year (currently 2 year). Will make it easier for people to volunteer and also balance the workload.

Question 19:

Facilitator – should we use a third party facilitator for the ETLG self-reflective discussion at our annual meeting in San Diego ?

| **1** | A) | Yes |
| **8** | B) | No |

Question 20:

Bonus Question for May Conf Call: What topics might might we discuss in the May conf call? Please indicate importance...

Workgroup suggestions. Reasonable time commitments for different kinds of work. Any recent input from ITLC?

IMS membership - discussion of value, cost, proposal for support from ITLC, future benefits of support

Question 21:

Please add your name & campus - (optional)

Rose Rocchio - UCLA

Larry - UCLA

David Levin - UC Davis

Gail Persily, UCSF - (did I answer twice. The survey was auto-completing some of my answers, but I'm not sure I ever hit submit the first time through. Sorry - hopefully my answers are consistent)

Todd A. Van Zandt - UC Merced

Israel Fletes, UC Riverside

Go Home