COLLABORATIVE DOMAIN GROUP (CDoG) MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

February 8, 2013 11:00am-12:30pm
Hatcher Graduate Library Gallery Lab

Attendees: Francine Alexander, Laurie Alexander, Connie Cook, Sean DeMonner, Monika Dressler, Matthew Kaplan, Mika LaVaque-Manty, Malinda Matney, Chris Quintana, John Merlin Williams, Vlad Wielbut, Mike Wojan, Chad Hershock, Barry Fishman, Dan Atkins, Cynthia Finelli, Anthony Whyte

Absences: Deborah Ball, Paul Courant, David Mendez, Kara Suzuka

Guests:
Huron Education Consultants: James DeVaney and Michael Stallworth
Collaboration Phase 2: Bill Wrobleski, Ryan Vis, and Dawn Brennan

Agenda:
http://cio.umich.edu/governance/collaborative-documents/20130208_CDoG_Agenda.pdf

Notes:

Collaboration Phase 2 Project - Bill Wrobleski, Ryan Vis, and Dawn Brennan

Background information: Bill works for ITS and traditionally runs a lot of infrastructure for the university. He is responsible for collaboration and productivity portfolio, deciding how to group services together and what the strategy is for grouping these services, and how to sustain them. He was responsible for the first implementation of Google services on campus.

Bill’s group has proposed a large-scale project called “Collaboration Phase 2“ to further integrate Google services into teaching and learning settings at U-M and to foster collaboration. This proposal was based on the realization that while Bill’s group succeeded in delivering a set of tools for everyone on campus, adoption of these tools is sporadic. This proposal did not get funded but Bill’s group is looking to move forward with a more tightly scoped effort that focuses on community building around the tools.

He requested feedback from this group about where and how to put time and energy into this project and how to creatively resource it. Recommendations include:

- Review CRLT white paper on faculty use of Google tools and be transparent about the limitations of some of the tools in specific learning/teaching settings.
- Consider developing an affiliates program similar to that developed when CTools launched. This group was composed of instructional designers, lead administrative support, some faculty, and IT staff. The development team for CTools provided them
with updates and received feedback. Opportunities for a ‘train the trainer’ model were utilized through this group. This may close the feedback loop for the campus.

- Develop specific case studies or user scenarios that address concrete examples of using Google tools and services in specific U-M education settings. This allows us to explore specific needs from the faculty or support to provide.
- Look to gather more feedback from students about their use of or demand for tools in the Google suite of services.

Huron Education Consulting Group - James DeVaney and Michael Stallworth

Huron Education proposed the following framing questions for this conversation:

- How does U-M keep up with innovative uses of technology-enabled learning across the higher education landscape?
- What are some of the biggest challenges that inhibit optimal adoption and use of technologies that enhance learning and instruction at U-M?
- What are some examples of knowledge sharing across schools / colleges as it relates to technology-enhanced learning?

Background information: Mike, from Huron Consulting, has been hired by the Office of the Provost to conduct an eight week study of the landscape of online education and make recommendations to this office and the POPS committee toward moving forward with developing an online education strategy (an “approach to enhancing or leveraging technology to enhance the learning experience”) for U-M. The group is currently connecting with groups like CDoG that are connected with technology and enhanced learning. They want to gather perspectives of individuals who have knowledge of learning and institutional knowledge of U-M. They have had a series of about 70 conversations with various stakeholders across campus.

Their goal with this study is to look for specific examples and opportunities to connect U-M’s institutional strength with the market need, with a goal of extending the reach of U-M, fulfill the mission of U-M and to provide U-M with an opportunity to take advantage of new revenue streams.

They are charged with thinking about developing a business case in reaching a new market with a focus on new audiences rather than thinking about the traditional in-residence experience. For example, what are the insights we’re taking away and learning from experiments like Coursera?

Around February 27, they will be conducting a working session with the POPS committee to share preliminary findings and review next steps.

Considerations from the CDoG group include:

- With some of this there are obvious resource constraints (where does faculty time come from to experiment? what is the impact on being able to teach in this institution?). Why are faculty spending their time on this? What is the reward structure like? How do you
get these ideas out there to faculty (with such a decentralized university like U-M). How do you really push this out so you are disseminating innovation?

- There are concerns about the tightness of scope in this study, that it focuses so much on developing new markets and revenue streams. The CDoG group would like to see the further development of this effort to address different learning needs and opportunities of our current communities. These learning needs should be tied to enhancing all pedagogical styles and the types of learning that happen well in specific settings. If we are only focusing on developing a revenue stream in a new market and not on increasing learning opportunities and strengthening pedagogy, then this study may not be successful.

- Stanford’s model of addressing an online learning model as an extension of the brick and mortar education available at their university is one we should be paying attention to. For example, every online course that is massive and open is tied to an in-person class. Chad recently returned from the ELI annual meeting and spoke with Stanford’s representatives. This is a more holistic approach to the scope of this study.

**Brief updates from working groups**

**Alliance Working Group**

They are continuing to develop workflows and moving forward with their pilot rapid technology assessments (Piazza and Lesson Builder in CTools). Piazza will be evaluated over a term, Lesson Builder will likely be evaluated in a month or less.

**IT Council**

The issue of lecture capture continues to be put off by the university as a whole and in the meantime departments are moving forward with their own solutions. While these cycles of technology development are expected, the university would benefit from a roadmap for how to address the cycles in a systematic way.

**Strategic Planning Group**

The focus of their last meeting was to identify how to gather campus input for the draft document of a vision statement. They will be meeting with various stakeholders. Mid May is the deadline for the document to be completed.

**Connected Learning**

A program outline will be sent to the group soon. The group is planning a half day event to focus on assessment done on particular environments (Design Lab 1, the GROCS program). It will be used to start a larger conversation around what it means to have connected learning environments.
Domain Mapping

They are formulating a set of questions and issues trying to learn what is in major (formal) use in all the units, currently polling unit IT staff. This may lead to an annual audit. Michael Wojen will be looking at informal tool use in different education settings. This may lead to an appendix to the strategic planning document.

Communications

There is a need for structured communication about how this group fits into other groups on campus. A subset of CDoG needs to engage with a communications manager to provide this communication to other groups.

Continued Discussion from January 4, 2013 meeting

At the last CDoG meeting, we started a discussion about the values we hold for the next LMS for the Ann Arbor campus. It would be helpful to pull together a small working group for the next month to map out paths forward to engage this question. The goal of this group would be to develop a document that outlines positive and negative approaches to this need. It's also an opportunity to enumerate some of the other emerging opportunities this group has discussed. Sean, Barry, Chris, Chad and Laurie will work on this. Dan and Francine can provide specific input and Moni will send someone from LSA.