

Notes 10.19.2018

Friday, October 19, 2018

2:01 PM

Jim Raber / John Rathje

- Banner upgrade – relatively smooth (helpdesk nothing out of ordinary) – about as quiet as can be
 - Did experience delay in EDW/Reporting coming up
- Office 365 rollout: most of ducks in the road (need Johns approval)
 - If we sign into OAH (tic tac toe grid) – UCT will have access to this
 - Teams, planner + a suite of different apps
 - Next time we meet, have a demo/training on the new apps we (UCT) will pilot
 - It is a lot like Slack – asynchronous file sharing chat, video conferencing... sign-up to be on the team
- Adobe agreement – approaching 2,000 student (510,000 \$ in savings + breakeven point for license purchasing)
 - Continuing to grow

Discussed focuses of division

- Portfolio of tools
 - Processes
 - Data
 - Lifecycle / onboarding / registration / etc.
 - Security
-
- Reorganized in IS to engage with university needs – very interested in user experience (what is it and what can make that better from digital and personal perspective)
 - Best at various channels those happen

Will be filled by new positions

- CISO
 - Filled by person who is not a 'no' person
 - Security review
- CDO

- Protecting Data
- Lifecycle
- Protect Information by virtue of industry
 - Europe passing of GDPR (person is in control of data that defines them)
 - Implications for us...if we're in EU, it applies
 - Changes our approach to privacy
 - Evangelism of data
 - Dashboards aimed at answering questions
 - Governance, common understanding of data terms (what is FTE)--data dictionary
 - Data quality
- Deputy CIO / CTO
 - Think of technology as a secondary item
 - Business dictates what we're looking to do, tools prop it up
 - Design & Align
 - Research enterprise
 - Absent in conversation. John was charged with improving research enterprise--focus, engage, and collaborate with research and sponsored programs to identify ways in which we can better support.

LMS in need of updating to ensure we have modern outcome

Faculty Senate decisions was recent to move it out of bubble sheet to online...make sure we have resiliency in network

Very interested in discussing with faculty, wants to have an advisory group

EaasyIT: Everything as a service with yesability

Shelly / LeighAnn: Who owns Instructional Technology?

-John Rathje: this is an opportunity for advisory committee. Role of educational technology should be one that enhances role. We (IS) are advisors in that, and can share what else is going on

Shelley: Who owns, support, training, etc.

-John Rathje: Whatever we do, we should consider the consistency around user experience. Our competitors are not other university's, but experiences that students are bringing in (Amazon, Nike)

are bringing in (Amazon, Nike)

Name of Information Services changed to Information Technology. Purpose with name, lost the name services due to create a new perception of what we do. Lose the perception of being a cost center. Looking to be engaged more, engaged with operations, services

Campaign will unveil over time.

Question: who will be managing changes, who is in charge of doing that

-John: Everybody. Different types of engagements and communications. Will work with whoever (deans, cabinet, vps). Funnel as many questions leadership, through Exec Dir of Ed Tech & Service Management (Jim). Very active in that communication and role. Also will be leveraging business process person (HR, Finance, etc). Someone dedicated at business / academic level to understand needs and limitations.

Will have regular communications on stuff being planned, outcomes, etc. Hope to see is projects that align with departmental/college/university objectives. Wishes to leverage lots of channels.

Question: Lots of tools that crossover, are we thinking strategic about data points on what needs are?

For LMS, yes. Need to identify gaps, current successes. Will be part of requirements building for RFP. Additional features are built in often times to create a value added perception, but end up duplicating services. Consideration needs to be placed on what is included and how to leverage existing tools.

Suggestion that recommendations be stronger, only go with one for students and that legacy system (Turning) has not be delivered.

Major differences between companies:

1/2 include devices, 1/2 do not.

Faculty feel strongly with both.

Recommendation boxes in report is good, meets everyone's needs. -if iClickers are selected, some way for students to have clicker for a year or two, they should be able

to use device (buy back or rental).

Will be sending out word document version of report for group editing / recommendations.

Clicker Sub review

Conducted a survey, received lots of information, demo last spring (TopHat, Turning, Poll Everywhere), is a huge decision.

Again held demos recently with additional vendors. Conducted evaluations on what people want vs. what do vendors offer. Companies included iClicker, HITT, Learning Catalytics

Does it work at student level, does it work for faculty. Draft report was sent out.
-recommend single vendor

Question: End result is to make students happy

Response: did we invite them, attendance was low. Found that faculty didn't have time or resources to do piloting.

Faculty are ultimate customer with pedagogy associated with Clickers - single tool to be chosen. Student satisfaction is not about the tool "I Hate Bb" might be a problem with how the technology is used, not with the tool itself. Technology of clickers may have been fine, but usage may not have been. General recommendations might be helpful in solving this.

Question: Have we considered asking vendors about grants to improve pedagogy, best practices with using tool. Getting faculty to be evangelists' of the tool.

-May not always be possible, not really up to us.

-Vendors typically have good rollout plans, but may not always have use cases/best practices due to size or position, but it is dependent upon us to ask. Not always about price.

Question: Is vendor support the right answer to tell faculty?

-Illustrates need to be able to rely on shared services, Ed Tech's Etc and to have singular supported solution.

-Important to understand where to go for what?

TopHat issues:

- Will not stop asking
- Not accessible
- Data security issues?

Recommendation that security look at data and privacy for vendors.

LMS RFP Update

- LMS review – sub-committee in addition to the RFP process
 - Want faculty voice on it – instructional designers
 - Val Kelly + Jim = lead roles (make sure things are compatible with what we have)
 - Will present to faculty senate on Monday: why RFP & why now, market has drastically changed so we at least need to review it
 - Rough timeline – requirements within committee + engagement for faculty not on committee (between now and December) + written proposal, hopefully in January, evaluate throughout Spring, start piloting and rolling out (18 months total) + get students voice in there (maybe through student senators)
 - What do we need in an LMS – please send in what you think we need to consider
 - Send this to Jim or Shelley via email
 - Participate how you can and how it fits your interest/schedule
 - What's your favorite LMS.... Any characteristics... send it to them!