Brendan Guenther
Director, IT Services Teaching and Learning
Michigan State University
brendan@msu.edu / *517-884-0679*

Strategy for Teaching & Learning Technology

Executive Summary of Topic

Senior Academic Technology Officers at major research institutions with large undergraduate populations have been evolving towards a deeper level of academic engagement. Long among the most mission-oriented of a CIO's direct reports, and well connected to partnerships beyond the IT organization, the connection to institutional identity, strategic intent, and expectations for measurable change have reached new heights for this part of our organizations. We present four case studies for consideration by the community, in preparation for our meeting at Cornell in Fall 2014. Please read these cases during your travel time or after you arrive in Ithaca, and prior to the discussions on Teaching and Learning.

Background

As an active member of the Educause Advisory Committee on Teaching and Learning, the SLOAN-C organization, Common Solutions Group and peer groups within the Committee for Institutional Cooperation (CIC), these groups have been discussing changes in structure in recent years with growing interest in organizational change.

It increasingly clear that institutions need strategic engagement of senior IT leadership in the core academic mission. Executives and board member expect alignment behind institutional identity, strategic goals and plans, as well as competitive progress on key performance indicators. As our planning group, spearheaded by Meena Lakhavani, Jen Stringer, Leila Shahbender, Linda Jorn, Tom Lewis, and I discussed strategic efforts on our campuses, we selected these cases as representative of the spectrum of initiatives and partnerships that campuses are initiating to meet the demand for strategic alignment around teaching and learning with technology.

Prior Views on Academic Technology & Executive Management

Much attention in higher education technology circles focuses on the CIO, where they report, what preparation they have, and what they focus their attention on. The data on these questions have not changed significantly in the last ten years (Brown, 2013), yet observers note a trend towards competencies of communication, collaboration, and alignment with partners on institutional strategy (Askren, 2013). Albright and Nworie (2008) established the best differentiation between CIOs and Senior Academic Technology Officers (SATOs), usually a Director-level position within CIO cabinets. A Senior Academic Technology Officer provides "strategic leadership and direction for all campus academic technology applications, initiatives, and support services" while serving as a "catalyst for curriculum improvement and change across the university". This vision for consolidating all online, blended, and in-person technologies that face instructors and students provided a blueprint for many organizational designs, formal partnerships beyond central IT, and informal linkages to the work of degree-granting academic units.

Evolution

We now see many of these partnerships bearing fruit, being recognized and formalized, and blurring the lines with the work of traditional teaching centers. Morrone et al (2014), gives the perspective of a teaching center director that has reorganized with IT, based on realigning for curricular change through reorganization at University of Indiana. These new organizational structures, whether they are explicit or composed as a virtual organization fuse traditional teaching center functions and IT units into a new hybrid unit, often in the CIO's orbit. This creates a strengthened service portfolio that serves curriculum reform, scholarship of teaching and learning, with strong technology capabilities. The cases we present represent a variety of approaches to meeting demand for applied technology that incentivizes institutional transformation, changes in faculty teaching practice, and satisfies the need for progress towards strategic objectives. In the spirit of a recent contribution by a CSG colleague (Kraemer, 2014), we believe each of these strategies illustrate a means of advancing without new resources, by aligning multiple existing structures and assets around their highest and best purposes.

Editor's Introduction to the Cases

1. **Tom Lewis** presents the technology unit's approach to pilot programs and incentives without any major organizational changes at **University of Washington**.
2. **Ben Maddox** tells us about new strategy and governance at **New York University** to create strategic alignment around teaching, learning and technology.
3. **Linda Jorn** writes about Educational Innovations, a major program at **University of Wisconsin Madison**, which could be seen as composing and aligning a virtual organization.
4. **Maggie Jesse** recounts the recent formal organizational changes, merging a teaching center with Academic IT, to operationalize the strategy at the **University of Iowa**.

Utilizing the Cases

Please read the cases comparatively. Consider the common themes that represent broader trends, likely derived from external and competitive pressures we all face. Reflect on the relative strengths of each approach from the three lenses of strategy (political, cultural, and organizational). Each author will be available to handle questions as a group based on these campus-cases, there will be minimal summary of the content presented here. Instead, we will engage you in an active discussion during the meeting. If you read the cases ahead of time, you will be better prepared to jump into the discussion and ask critical questions. We are interested in gaining understanding from the various professional sub-specialty perspectives we commonly see at a CSG meeting. On behalf of our organizing group, I thank you for your preparation, and I look forward to seeing you in Ithaca.

References

Albright, M. & Nworie, J. (2008). Rethinking Academic Technology Leadership in an Era an Era of Change, *Educause Review, 31(1). Retrieved from: http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/rethinking-academic-technology-leadership-era-change*

Askren, M. (2013). The CIO: Defining a Career for the Future, Educause Review, 48(3). Retrieved from: http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/cio-defining-career-future

Brown, W. (2013). *2013 Higher Education Chief Information Officer Roles and Effectiveness*. Albany, NY: Center for Higher Education Chief Information Officer Studies, Inc. Retrieved from: http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ECAR_SO/ERS/ERS1313/ERS1313b.pdf

Kraemer, R. (2014). Advancing Without New Resources, *Educause Review*, 49(4). Retrieved from: http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/advancing-without-new-resources

Morrone, A., Stephens, S., Walters, C., Dallis, D. & Engel, S. (2013). Partnering for Transformative Teaching, Educause Review Online, July 1, 2013. Retrieved from: http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/partnering-transformative-teaching

Piloting with a Purpose: How IT Can Lead the Way to New Teaching & Learning Technologies

Tom Lewis, Director
Academic & Collaborative Applications

Over the years, UW-IT has forged a method of leadership through inquiry. We've developed a method of leading the way to new teaching and learning technology that poses generative questions and works with the information those questions reveal. This method relies on a culture of collaboration and experimentation, as outlined below.

(1) What is the noteworthy teaching and learning technology strategy?

Rather than waiting for faculty, students, or administrators to lead the charge towards new teaching and learning technologies, the staff of University of Washington Information Technology (UW-IT) often identify promising new technologies and then work in partnership with instructional technologists and teaching support staff to pilot, assess, and -- if warranted -- implement. As IT professionals, we must be conversant with teaching technology trends, bleeding edge technologies, and enterprise approaches. With that familiarity, we can survey the horizon to figure out what is next and what can best support staff, instructors, and students.

Critical to the pilot process is the active participation of faculty and students. Their feedback, collected by UW-IT's assessment team, is reflected back to campus users, instructional support staff, and administrators, and then incorporated into the service design for technologies that will be rolled out to the enterprise. This process is led by IT, but user centered, which gives outcomes great legitimacy.

(2) How does the process work?

Partners in Crime

First, you need co-conspirators, in our case a vibrant community of instructional technologists and teaching support staff who provide front-line support in their colleges, schools, or departments. Typically, we incorporate some partners into a pilot working group that contributes to the assessment and helps craft recommendations. We reach out to others for assistance in finding faculty participants. We also rely on a cadre of early adopter faculty, and frequently query all users of an existing technology to gain a diverse set of faculty participants. Students in their courses are next, though many times we will query all student users of a technology or simply head to the library or student activity center for impromptu focus groups.

Co-conspirators participate because they have chosen to do so, but also because UW-IT always reflects the pilot results and assessments back to the campus community through white papers or short reports that contain recommendations about whether or how to proceed with a particular technology. The outcomes reflect a history of participation and input so campus sees UW-IT as a trusted leader and partner in teaching and learning technology innovation.

Assessment and Evaluation Process

Key to the whole method is a needs assessment and evaluation process, which requires a team with talents that

IT may not typically have (more on this below). Pilots always assess a range of areas: faculty and student needs for the technology and their satisfaction with it; its usability and accessibility; how easy it is to support; how well we can work with the vendor; and the ability to integrate the technology with enterprise systems. We even try to discover impacts on teaching and learning. So, we have many measures to judge whether a particular technology is working.

Support from Campus Partners

When we do go live with a new technology, the campus partners typically help with uptake. For example, our Center for Teaching and Learning features "Faculty and Professional Learning Communities" on new technologies, in which faculty can learn from trusted colleagues who participated in the pilot. Attention to the needs of instructional technologists and teaching support staff also means we have buy-in from people who are among instructors' first line of support. And because the assessment digs into usability, accessibility, support, and enterprise integration, we already have crucial pieces of the implementation strategy in hand.

(3) Who's doing it?

Although we always work with faculty, students, and support staff, the cast of characters and collaborators necessarily varies with each pilot. A recent pilot of two new active learning classrooms exemplifies how the collaboration works. Two such classrooms were incorporated in a recent remodel of the undergraduate library, so we worked with librarians and teaching support staff to study the effects on teaching and learning. By conducting observations with our partners, and conducting focus groups and surveys with instructors and students, we were able to identify best practices for teaching in the rooms and a minimum set of physical and technological features essential to support active learning in any new classroom designs. We have shared what we learned, particularly about the minimum essential technological features, so that other groups on campus benefit from our efforts.

(4) What are the downsides and risks of this approach?

Done right, there are no downsides or risk with this pilot process. We try many things, fail at quite a few, and that is okay. Even in the failures, we continue to get smarter, one project to the next. The pilot and needs assessment creates criteria by which to evaluate the adequacy of a potential enterprise solution. If one solution does not work, the needs assessment is not wasted; it can be applied to the next potential solution, and updated as needed in the future. When results do not support moving forward with implementation, we have at least gathered better requirements, and engaged the user community around the process and options. When we do move forward, we have supported early adopters, and learned about issues to address or monitor during implementation.

For example, in 2012-13 UW-IT evaluated two eText platforms that differed in their adoption model, collaborative features, and other factors, but were similar enough for a fair comparison. The goal of the research was to determine, based on the viewpoints of students and instructors, which approach was the best fit for our university. Following a pilot of

these two platforms in 15 courses, the pilot team determined that neither were ready for adoption due to accessibility issues, the limited availability of books in eText format, the lack of feature use by students, and lack of learning technology integration. Most importantly, we saw no clear indication that eTextbooks enhanced student learning. The pilot team advised the UW community that we should monitor the evolution of eText, paying special attention to the emergence of enhancements that were desired by UW students and instructors and solutions to the issues just mentioned. The technology did not work out, but we are better prepared for the future.

(5) Why is this strategy significant to Academic Affairs, the Provost, or the CIO?

As tuition rises and student expectations for a technology infused academic experience increase, as the need to reach more students at a distance or with different learning styles expands, and as institutions strive to attract faculty who want leading edge teaching technologies, this leadership strategy provides an agile and effective way to introduce new technologies. The openness and inclusiveness of the strategy, along with the data-driven decisions, lead to outcomes that are generally legitimate and without controversy.

(6) Where are things headed?

In the last few years, UW-IT has employed this strategy with "foundational" teaching and learning technologies such as learning management systems, lecture capture software, eTexts, audience response systems, and active learning classrooms. Increasingly, we are applying the pilot strategy, and especially the needs assessment component, to the broader student experience. The following example illustrates the potential for data from one assessment project influencing and shaping the recommendations of another.

A Want Without Clear Need

Several years ago, administrators asked for and received an evaluation of new portal technologies -- LifeRay, uPortal -- to replace the existing homegrown enterprise portal. The resulting selection process conducted by UW-IT compared portal features but did not identify the needs that had motivated the initial request for a portal replacement, nor any clear path for meeting those needs.

Later analysis of portal usage data and user research with students found that they experienced information overload, and needed help to identify timely, relevant, personal information and tools to help them successfully complete their business with the university. This needs assessment resulted in a project to build a new, custom Web application to provide students with timely notices about registration and financial balances, display their class schedule, housing information, library account, and relevant campus events and information. This new application is being piloted and released iteratively.

Discovering the Obstacles

At the same time, UW-IT received a request to help implement a new Web site to provide information to students on co-curricular activities, such as internships, fellowships, study abroad, volunteering, and so on. In response, we

carried out another needs assessment to understand the problems student were encountering when attempting to participate in co-curricular activities.

We identified two main areas for IT improvement: tools for managing communications with students *through the new portal*; and a system for tracking data about student participation. The needs assessment also generated additional questions to help the Provost define the goals and success metrics for student participation in co-curricular activities. These outcomes ranged very far from the initial goal of an informational Web site. The productive outcome of this needs assessment illustrates, among other things, the necessity for a culture that supports experimentation and visionary solutions.

Ideally, future applications of this pilot and assessment approach will include closer ties with more campus partners. Wider participation would yield greater understanding of campus needs and an increased ability to draw relationships among and between various efforts on campus. With the two projects just mentioned, for example, we gathered input from a group of campus partners with whom we have had little relationship in the past, people with great insights into the student experience. As teaching and learning continues to extend beyond the classroom -- in online and hybrid courses, co-curricular activities, service learning, and so on -- the settings UW-IT needs to investigate and the partners we need to work with will inevitably extend.

(7) What does this strategy need from IT and the CIO?

For this strategy to succeed, IT needs a culture of user-centered design, where staff reach out to and connect meaningfully with faculty, students, and campus partners as a matter of course. IT needs to focus on fostering relationships as well as building code. Another important cultural component is a commitment to iteration, where IT can pilot a technology and then either walk away or fully release. Just as important, IT needs the right kind of staff who can perform assessments and interact with end users, including business analysts, research scientists with research study design experience and quantitative and qualitative assessment skills, staff conversant in data analytics, and user-centered designers.

This approach of innovation and leadership through inquiry, through collaboration, and through relationship building has the potential to reach -- and support -- every corner of the university. The goals of key populations -- certainly instructors, students, and staff, but also administration and executive offices -- can benefit from growing a culture in which outreach is expected and encouraged. UW-IT is in a position to enable enterprise-level change, but change that is based on real evidence from the people who need and expect cutting edge learning and teaching technologies.

Ben Maddox
Deputy Chief Global Technology Officer
Ben.maddox@nyu.edu / 917-709-7498

Executive Summary

In December of 2012, NYU launched a University-wide technology enhanced education initiative. This includes formation of a faculty-led committee, IT support pilots, engagement with executive leadership and Trustees, new resources for course and curricular design support, and a more intentional approach to encouraging innovation among individual faculty and students.

(1) What is a noteworthy Teaching and Learning technology strategy?

A teaching and learning technology strategy is the overall program of how institutions use academic, curricular, administrative and technical expertise to enhance instruction and meet institutional goals. An optimal plan is about education and how technology can undergird the teaching and learning mission of the institution, not a commentary on the LMS.

The Plan should be:

Specific: First and foremost, a teaching and learning technology strategy should be honest about what it is trying to achieve. Unless one or some of the goals are about technology, then it mostly likely includes a significant effort at the school and department level about goals.

Measurable: With some specific goals in mind, the strategy should have explicit areas where the Institution, school, etc. hopes to grow, gain, save or learn that can be measured or evaluated:

Example Measures:

- Increased access to new student communities
- Decrease time to degree/Flexibility for Students/Faculty
- Reduced Costs (Space, Operations)
- Innovative Instruction and Engagement
- Improved Learning Outcomes in the discipline
- Computational skills' acquisition for students for employability
- Commitment to Open Ed: Great Faculty + Open Access (Free)
- Increase enrollment at lower per student cost than in-person instruction

Visible & Inclusive: Visible to and Involved with Faculty Governance and Faculty/Students as Individual Contributors (Specifically and Intentionally).

Adaptable: Scalable, Shape-able or Scrap-able

(2) How does the process work?

At NYU, the process works through a combination of coalition work (the willing and skeptical), sponsorship (academic and operational sponsorship), course correction, and relationship management.

(3) Who's doing it?

There are two key current coordinated Institutional initiatives that are activated through the combined efforts of the Office the Provost, Deans and Schools (Academic), IT and Libraries.

Academic Planning

- Provost sponsored strategy development from each school on tech enhanced education.
- Formation of a Faculty Committee and New IT Governance Structure
- New team of instructional technologists to work with faculty on enhancing their teaching.
- Allocation of additional pedagogical and instructional support positions within the schools to compliment central team and propagate support for instructional needs at the schools.
- New unit, Enterprise Initiatives, to focus on external engagement opportunities

Operational Planning: Support Pilot for Enhancing Services across Units

Sponsored by and All-Faculty Committee, Provost, Libraries, IT, Office of Academic Assessment and Center for Advancement of Teaching; we created a virtual team to execute this referred to as ESMITS (Enhanced Service Model for Instructional Technology Support).

Pilot Goals (2013):

1. Help faculty more **easily and efficiently find** our services throughout all NYU campuses, schools, and sites.
2. Increase **visibility of, and access** to, new and existing services
3. **Capture metrics** to identify emerging trends and met/unmet needs for tools, skills, training, and collaboration.
4. Leverage **collective strengths** and skills across teams

Next Steps:

1. On Board School-based resources
2. Work with facilities to improve **proprietary classrooms**
3. Enhance **capacity for existing facilities** as service points for instructional technology
4. Strengthen cross functional knowledge through **training and certification**
5. Support workshops and outreach for **faculty-to-faculty collaboration**

Service Design:

Instructional Technology Support

- Common Service listings and Knowledge Base
- One metrics tool for continuous service improvement (ServiceLink/Service Now)
- Protocols for handing off customers to one another
- In-take points serve as geographic borders, not political ones

(4) What are the downsides and risks?

- Innovation at the individual level and Data Stewardship for student academic data
- Experimentations and innovation mean getting used to failure and moving on
- It can be easier to focus on the technology than learning/skills, curricular or other goals

(5) Why is your strategy significant to Academic Affairs and Faculty work?

Universities and educational institutions across the United States are struggling to respond to dynamic shifts in learning styles, a more competitive global market, and increased expenses in the face of reduced federal and state funding. This is driving a deep reconsideration of the historic residential education model, curricular planning and pedagogy. In addition to the 10 million students who have signed up for MOOCs in the last 2 years, according to recent surveys, more than 30% of US undergraduate students surveyed in 2012 reported to being currently enrolled in at least 1 online course.

(6) Where are things headed?

The global student population (18-25 year olds) is growing rapidly and our institutions have an opportunity to participating in educating them around the world in new ways.

How will broader trends impact this strategy?

- Outsourcing likely to become cheaper for next few years while venture capital money plays out, allowing third party methods to test the market.
- Government and Regulatory Environment for Higher Ed likely to be more active.
- Innovation by individuals will introduce some risk as faculty who 'do their own thing' build outside of University governance or infrastructure.

(7) What does this strategy need from IT?

Responsiveness, Openness and Agility

- Help your staff see the value in collaboration, rather than focusing on turf.
- An agile process for handling development requests.
- Help create (virtual) spaces that are safe for innovation, and low risk to the institution. Is there a Hackathon model for faculty technology innovation?
- Engage with what is happening in Higher Education as a field, by knowing what peer institutions are working on.
- Leading and supporting simultaneously.

Linda Jorn
Associate Vice Provost for Learning Technologies and DoIT Direcor of Academic Technology
jorn@wisc.edu / *608-262-3098*

(1) What is a Noteworthy Teaching and Learning with Technology Strategy?

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison the central IT organization is closely aligned with a chancellor-sponsored, campus-wide institutional change initiative called Educational Innovation (EI), which is in its third year (started in July, 2011). EI empowers faculty, staff, and students to be change agents as they transform teaching, learning, and engagement with the goal of inspiring students and empowering communities. The vision for EI is to be a world leader in preparing our students and communities to meet the challenges of the 21st century and beyond by developing an innovative, student-centered learning environment within an engaged public research university. Leveraging new technologies and partnerships is at the core of three EI goals: pivoting the student experience to pervasive active learning; building innovative professional masters-level degrees and other lifelong learning opportunities, and extending our education mission to Wisconsin and the world.

EI leaders have identified the importance of technology in meeting EI goals. The campus will develop projects that incorporate active learning and new technologies to improve capacity and quality in high-demand, high-enrollment courses; will use multiple delivery modes (e.g., online learning) to expand the reach of UW-Madison professional Masters-level degrees, capstone certificate programs, and other credentials throughout the state, nation, and the world, in alignment with the strategic goals of schools and colleges and the market demand for such credentials; will expand offerings to Wisconsin residents, alumni, and the world through mutually-beneficial collaborations with public, nonprofit, and private sector partners and through innovative technologies and delivery formats (e.g., blended, MOOCs); and will enhance global awareness through international partnerships and technology-enhanced approaches to teaching and learning.

(2) How do we make it work? & (3) Who's doing it?

Early on the Chancellor instituted an 'institutional change model structure' to ensure that EI change agents exist throughout the organization. EI is sponsored by the provost and chancellor. EI is led by EI co-chairs: our vice provost for undergraduate teaching and learning and our vice provost for lifelong learning and dean of the Division of Continuing Studies. An EI Core team of seven campus leaders meet weekly (for the last three years; this team is currently undergoing changes) to discuss strategy, tactics, and projects. EI core team members bring expertise regarding undergraduate learning assessment, communications, quality improvement, academic technology (the associate vice provost for learning technologies and director of the Division of Information Technology (DoIT) Academic Technology unit sits on the EI core team), and faculty/staff work patterns. The provost creates EI "Tiger Teams" consisting of the EI Core Team and experts in various areas of campus administration to address major

Linda Jorn
Associate Vice Provost for Learning Technologies and DoIT Direcor of Academic Technology
jorn@wisc.edu / *608-262-3098*

emerging EI strategic and policy issues, such as enrollment management, academic planning, and institutional research. Each school or college has appointed an EI point person, and these representatives meet to share issues, ideas, and best practices. In addition, each EI point person has organized a committee at the school, college, or division level. The EI Advisory Committee includes formal governance representation from the University Committee representing faculty, the Academic Staff Executive Committee, and the Associated Students of Madison, as well as three EI point people, to assist in deeper campus-wide engagement and policy questions.

During all phases of the EI efforts, we engaged IT professionals as key campus partners. Our vice provost for information technology—also the chief information officer—joined and championed early campus EI planning conversations. This decision helped to steer strategic conversations and decisions around the costs, needed resources, and strategic directions for learning technologies and ensured our academic technology professionals were integrated into, rather than segmented from, the EI effort.

The EI Core Team designed regular campus engagement events with the campus teaching/learning/technology community, initiated EI projects (e.g. MOOCs, online professional masters-level degree and capstone certificate programs, blended-learning faculty development programs, EI funded innovation grants ($30K to $300K)), and developed a virtual organizational structure and budget to sustain EI efforts.

(4) What are the downsides and risks?

As noted, EI has gained central funding (approved by the Provost and institutional CFO). This funding goes towards several areas. For example, it funds services that were formally program revenue and that are now considered strategic and central to EI efforts (e.g. online course production services); provide grant-like money to faculty lead innovation projects; has allowed for the hiring of new professionals with course design, learning assessment, course production, communication, project management, evaluation/learning analytics expertise; will upgrade learning spaces; and will allow for our future learning technology ecosystem.

This funding is distributed across a virtual organization consisting of the central IT organization, Division of Continuing Studies, Academic Planning and Institutional Research, and Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning Office. These organizations are creating new processes for working together to hire new team members; ensure an organizational structure that allows these new team members who are situated in different organizations to work together under the EI umbrella; develop complimentary project management practices, and define new budget processes. One new EI co-lead and a new provost (both new July/August 2014) has meant that new leaders need to learn the EI history and decision making process, so in this transition decisions take longer to make, while there is pressure to keep

Linda Jorn
Associate Vice Provost for Learning Technologies and DoIT Direcor of Academic Technology
jorn@wisc.edu / *608-262-3098*

projects on time and within scope. EI has been successful in measuring success at a project based level (e.g. for our new MOOC efforts), but is working on a more robust framework for measuring success for the EI effort.

(5) Why is it significant to Academic Affairs and Faculty work?

Advances in knowledge about expertise, learning, and assessment, along with advances in technology, changes in federal policies, and the University of Wisconsin Madison's Educational Innovation effort, afford faculty and instructors a remarkable opportunity to pivot efforts to ensure all undergraduates experience meaningful active learning activities upon graduation. Designing for active learning, will ensure our students' can build on their personal interests and passions with the support of peers, faculty, instructors, staff, and local and global community partners to develop the knowledge, motivation, skills, persistence, curiosity, and determination they need for their career success and civic engagement. EI explores the intersection of new technologies, assessment methods, and learning science information to engage in targeted pilots that ensure we design complimentary delivery modes that will meet the learning needs of our students now and into the future.

(6) Where are things headed?

As EI starts into its fourth year, with a new Provost, Chancellor, and one new EI co-lead, the EI co-leads are reassessing the EI support structures and targeting key projects for fiscal year 15-16. IT leaders are at the table for those discussions to ensure we have focused projects with measurable success. In addition, EI leaders are looking at funding innovations that are scalable and sustainable (e.g. learning analytics; the learning technology infrastructure).

(7) What does this strategy need from IT?

The EI effort has required a transparent IT organization with well-defined services. The core services that have been key to the success of the EI partnership include online course production, video production, project management, learning technology project evaluation (e.g., full time evaluators that can evaluate projects and impact on learning), learning technology consultation, learning technology enterprise tools, (e.g. LMSs), and faculty engagement services (e.g. faculty development programs for blended learning, online learning).

In addition the following core practices have guided IT during EI project selection and management, as well as our communication with campus members:

- Support an educational innovation institutional change effort that builds on cultural practices and creates a 'cultural space' for innovations to emerge.
- Learn by doing – work on a portfolio of innovation projects that apply learning science ideas and practices.
- Focus on specific learner needs.

Linda Jorn
Associate Vice Provost for Learning Technologies and DoIT Direcor of Academic Technology
jorn@wisc.edu / *608-262-3098*

- Create interdisciplinary project teams that use appropriate project management practices.
- Support faculty with course design professionals.
- Support evaluation, research, and learning assessment efforts and share lessons learned.
- Develop, with peers, a shared vision for and adoption of the next-generation of learning technology infrastructure.
- Develop faculty and staff engagement programs
- Develop a culture of scalable and sustainable innovations.

Maggie Jesse
Senior Director
ITS Office of Teaching, Learning, & Technology
maggie-jesse@uiowa.edu / 319-335-6335

Case for a New Teaching and Learning with Technology Strategy

(1) What is a noteworthy Teaching and Learning with Tech strategy at Iowa?

In 2014, under the executive sponsorship of Associate Provost Beth Ingram and CIO Steve Fleagle, three separate instructional support units on campus – ITS Instructional Services (ITS-IS), the Center for Teaching (CfT), and Evaluation and Examination Service (EES) – were consolidated. These three groups were reorganized and revitalized into the Office of Teaching, Learning, & Technology (OTLT).

The reorganization was part of the University's strategy to support, develop and encourage faculty and TA professional teaching and learning strategies, including active-learning pedagogies. The question "What academic learning experience do you want your students to have?" is at the heart of what we do; that question spans pedagogy, faculty and TA professional development, facilities, and technology. Aligning the structures and cultures of these three units is intended to:

- Be a catalyst for conversations about emerging best practices in teaching methods, including effective assessment and instructional technology
- Be the default group for developing faculty and TA teaching and learning expertise
- Develop and support engaged and vibrant faculty and TA development programs and learning communities
- Provide robust instructional technologies such as the campus-wide course management system (ICON), lecture capture, wiki, etc.
- Support test scoring and statistical analysis, course evaluations, placement and national tests
- Support the very best classroom environments with well-designed and supported facilities and technologies
- Identify, pilot and support emerging technologies in partnership with faculty and collegiate IT staff
- Leverage our national reputation through continued collaboration with faculty and peers on research-based instructional assessment that improves teaching at the UI and contributes to national discussions of improved teaching and learning
- Sponsor cutting-edge workshops, seminars and campus-wide lecture events on teaching and learning

The new department is headed by a Senior Director who reports directly to the CIO, as well as having a dotted line relationship to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. Both the CIO and the Associate Provost report directly to the Provost.

(2) How do we make it work?

Historically, most decisions on the University of Iowa campus are community driven. Given that the decision to consolidate these three units was more top-down than usual, the executive sponsors created a broad and rapid community engagement plan that started in early February 2014. The plan included individual conversations with key stakeholders, large group discussions and creation of a faculty Transition Advisory Committee. In all,

over 450 people received direct communication regarding the new structure and were provided opportunities to discuss and question the new structure. A public transition web site was created to communicate with all campus constituents. The web site provided FAQs on the merger as well as opportunities for feedback, including anonymous feedback.

This rapid communication plan benefited from strong relationships across campus that have been built up over the years through cross-unit project work such as our active leaning environments (TILE) and our new Learning Commons, as well as through communities such as the Support Community for Instructional Technology, the Campus IT Leaders, the Learning Spaces Advisory Committee, the Learning Spaces Executive Committee and the Academic Technology Advisory Committee. It is notable that all of these projects and communities have been formed and led by ITS.

A strategic plan and roadmap is emerging based on the feedback of campus constituents and community leaders. This plan is guided by the campus strategic plan and the Campus IT Strategic Plan and the success of OTLT will be measured against those plans, as well as the satisfaction of the faculty and TAs who benefit from our services and events.

(3) Who's doing it?

The core constituents of the OTLT services are the faculty, instructors and TAs across campus. Many of these constituents currently receive services from their local collegiate providers and OTLT is benefiting from the long standing, solid relationships with those providers that have been supported by the community groups listed above. Faculty will continue to engage with local support as needed, but will always have access to OTLT staff and services as well. Staff in OTLT will partner and support local partners through events, online resources and solid enterprise-level instructional technologies, as well as providing direct faculty and TA support as needed.

(4) What are the downsides and risks?

While this new structure has been strongly supported by the Provost and by most collegiate leaders on campus, there are a number of faculty who have responded negatively to what they perceive as the "loss of the Center for Teaching". In order to make this reform last it will be critical for us to show that the Center for Teaching has not been lost and has, in fact, been injected with new staffing and budgetary resources to provide increased and improved opportunities for faculty development.

Since moving the Center for Teaching into this new structure the director, who previously had one direct report, now has four full time staff members and 10 part time graduate and undergraduate students. She has also been provided with greatly increased administrative support to free up her time for more faculty engagement. The Center for Teaching staff are now physically located in the same area as the other OTLT staff and are already benefiting from cross-unit project and event partnerships.

(5) Why is it significant to Academic Affairs and Faculty work?

The CIO at Iowa reports directly to the Provost. Over the past 10 years, the CIO and the academic technology directors who have worked for him have been responsible for major services and initiatives that have contributed to the decision to create the OTLT. These initiatives include creating solid, integrated, campus-wide instructional technologies; designing, developing and supporting 8 TILE spaces; supporting a robust faculty development program for active learning; and constructing and supporting a new 37,000 square foot Learning Commons. The Provost depends on the CIO to create highly effective systems (people, programs, spaces, and technology) that provide what faculty and instructors need to deliver the best instruction possible.

(6) Where are things headed?

In the coming year the new group will continue listening and responding to campus needs, developing and delivering strategic initiatives, and assessing success. We hope to report great progress next year.

(7) What does this strategy need from IT?

Central IT must continue to be flexible and responsive to the academic needs of the campus. This will require a better understanding and responsiveness to the academic sensitivities of the faculty. This has to be balanced against the IT culture of delivering enterprise-level services.