COLLABORATIVE DOMAIN GROUP (CDoG) MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

Thursday, March 7, 2013
Hatcher Graduate Library Gallery Lab

Attendees: Francine Alexander, Stein Brunvand, Sean DeMonner, Monika Dressler, Barry Fishman, Chad Hershock, Matthew Kaplan, Gautam Kaul, David Mendez, Emily Rodgers, Kara Suzuka, Philip Treib, John Merlin Williams, Vlad Wielbut

Absences: Laurie Alexander, Deborah Ball, Connie Cook, Paul Courant, Cynthia Finelli, Susan Hollar, Mika LaVaque-Manty, Malinda Matney, Chris Quintana, Anthony Whyte, Mike Wojan, Dan Atkins

Agenda:
http://cio.umich.edu/governance/collaborative-documents/20130307_CDoG_Agenda.pdf

Comments by Gautam Kaul - Special Counsel for Digital Education Initiatives, Office of the Provost:

Background: Dr. Kaul participates on the POPs committee and on the committee about online learning opportunities and models. He is also involved in a national series of conversations with universities like Indiana, Stanford, Columbia, Rice and Virginia. These universities are also examining what their next LMS might look like and how to collaborate effectively with each other. Dr. Kaul’s role is to provide overlap and communication between the internal and external committees and conversations around the same topics.

As Special Counsel for Digital Education Initiatives, he considers the challenges of our institutional organization to be opportunities. The coordination role of the Provost’s office should be to help define what the university does as a whole as there is no ‘right’ way to use online learning opportunities and techniques. He will be spending the next six months participating academic conversations to understand better how to define how MOOCs can inform on-campus learning experiences, how universities can protect their copyright and intellectual property and make informed decisions about the residential learning experience.

Updates from Working Groups:

Alliance Working Group (Chad)
An evaluation of Piazza was started this month on campus. It includes nine student surveys across disciplines. It will be administered in the last two weeks of March and will be followed by interviewing the faculty of a variety of classes. They have also developed a faculty IT special interest group with 60 volunteers, representing a range of disciplines and experience with IT.
They will be organizing a rapid evaluation consisting of one 90 minute session with a subset of the faculty IT special interest group to gather data on ease of use with the evaluated technology. The pilot test is with Lesson Builder.

The evaluation process map Chad and Susan created was shared with a group of educators with representation from Northwestern, Indiana University, and Wisconsin.

**Strategic Plan Group (David)**
This effort has been divided into two parts: 1) defining a vision for what we think the overall idea of information technology and education and institutional IT support should be; and 2) gathering input from faculty, students, and others. This group has met or will be meeting with Laura Patterson, Tim McKay, Phil Deloria, Ted Hanss, and other constituents to define scope and gather more information. They are also developing a student group from LSA. The first stage, including information gathering, and initial framework will be complete in April. Their target date is May to finish developing the vision and the strategic plan.

**Connected Learning Environment Workshop Group (John and Chris)**
The event next Friday (March 15) will gather people across campus who have an interest or investment in connected learning environments. We have adopted the definition from the MacArthur foundation’s report and will feature research gathered about Design Lab 1 and the GROCs program. Two follow up sessions are planned for Enriching Scholarship in May. This is the first event affiliated with CDoG and will introduce this group to the campus community.

**Domain Mapping Group (Barry and Matt)**
This group is developing a questionnaire or interview template that would come from different IT units reporting what tools what tools are being used, where they are being used, why they are being used. Melinda and Michael will lead a student focused approach that will be slightly different (‘a day in the life’ model). The group will invite the IT Commons group to collaborate on the coordination of this activity.

**Communication (Sean)**
We need to develop a communications effort and a brand for CDoG. To date, no other CDoG members have volunteered to participate in this effort. ITS has allocated time from one staff member to support this effort, including reviewing how this group is communicating to campus.

Indiana University is an example of an effective widespread communications campaign regarding similar efforts, but they have a more mature governance structure that includes creating a brand for a set number of activities called Next IU (http://next.iu.edu/).

**Continuing the LMS Discussion**

See: [CDoG LMS Strategy Framing presentation](#)
See: text from CDoG LMS Strategy Framing presentation
This presentation is a framework to get feedback on: the content and the presentation of the content. Eventually this will serve as a draft for what we want to present to the broader campus about our work and considerations.

The acronym “LMS” is problematic; it implies a single application when we’re envisioning an environment that likely has a lot of services. Many current LMS questions are focused on technical infrastructure. A broader question to consider is: how do we engage the campus?

This presentation structured in classic strategic planning format: future state, current state, gap analysis, ideas for next steps (tactical plan) to realize vision.

**Slide: Proposed Target Vision**
Sakai was developed as a CMS. What we think of as course groups are actually project teams. This perspective of project collaboration a has been well received and implemented across U-M and we need to consider sustaining these administrative and project-based collaborations in any new environments.

This platform must support both online and in class engagement. Should this platform be ‘everything to everyone,’ especially considering U-M’s investment in Google services? If we move to a more narrowly defined LMS/CMS, it is going to require investigation to determine how robust other systems are to support collaboration.

This broad statement reconsiders how U-M frames this kind of support. For example, if you accept the fact that everyone can build their own computer if they have access to interoperable basic elements, then the issue is identifying and supporting the right set of standards upon which the applications are built rather than building a computer for everyone.

**Slide: Definition**
This diagram grew out of a verbs exercise, the outer rings are systems capabilities. It represents a shift conversation from “platform and features” to “capabilities and interactions” that the environment would need to support. The diagram is still in draft form.

**Slide: Characteristics**
A good example of the “FREE” concept is Lecture Capture. Where does this fit with the series of features for faculty to use in the classroom?

We need to consider user autonomy, access control, and policy compliance in higher education. For example, higher ed friendly copyrights and licensing models. These are similar discussions that the Alliance and other universities are having about institutional needs.

**Slide: Enterprise Architecture Bricks**
CDoG can focus on helping the university think through which bricks the university should support and which bricks schools and departments (i.e. Business School) should support or
add. The university can't control all the bricks, so what is the minimum number we need to support? Our goal is to develop a learn platform with a lot of flexibility.

Do we need to align this thinking with the work and progress IT Rationalization has made?

The CDoG mapping project is also trying to discover commonalities and the trade off between customization and getting most out of our investments (i.e. larger contracts).

*Slide: T&L Universe*

Research (as a noun) should be tangential to teaching and learning. While research is fundamental to our mission, how we do it may not be a large part of this specific conversation.

Right now this feels faculty-centric. Students are starting to create a lot of content and have an interest in controlling this content and their own data.

*Note: Conversation stopped at the Strawman Strategy slide to resume at the next CDoG meeting.*