ATAC – Minutes
Meeting of October 18, 2007 in San Francisco


Transforming Course Design

- What advice is to be given to the Provosts regarding this?
- Large enrollment + poor student performance classes, and faculty engaged in redesign and willing to collaborate across campuses
- What will be the work for spring, what strategies will be followed, and what will be the outcomes?
- Need implementation and solution recommendations from ATAC.
- Intellectual Property issues associated with faculty work for hire - Ownership of innovative product.
  Who has right? Faculty as 'consultants'
  Earlier it was limited effort by faculty – complementary. Now it is different.
- The campus will offer courses through existing programs.
- Individual campuses can submit projects
  Spring – Identification and strategizing
  At least two courses - consistent
  Will technology be cost effective?
  What will be the effectiveness?
  Eliminate cost reduction from plan
  Is technology best utilized here?
  Use pedagogy "experts" as well in the planning.
  Take into account that campuses are differently organized
- ITL being reenergized - course design
  Similarities across campus and contact areas - faculty judge effectiveness + outcome. Will be faculty development

  Need to decide
- Work expectations of faculty in the spring
- Out comes
- Funding

- Tie into users and needs
  Deference to CIO may not be appropriate since lack of specificity
  Treat it as a pilot project
- Deliverables - scholarly research on what is working.

Faculty - Researcher vs. Object maker (IP issue)
Goals/Benefits of Transforming Course Design

Outcomes - Accessible
  Pertinent to project at hand
May need baseline data
Enhance offerings based on technology at campuses

What is faculty readiness of technology?
Technology not for technology sake
Technology to benefit pedagogy and learning.

How many people/faculty? Not 40
  Evaluate available tools and resources
  Utilize faculty often and in context
  Discover good tools - engage campus and faculty.
  Pedagogically effective
  Also faculty development needs to be considered.
  May need core group of faculty and large group for advising
  Core – Assigned time
  Support and communication
  Faculty should be involved and integrated
  Need pedagogy experts as well

• Are the students technology ready?
  Have model - ECON 1A and ECON 1B
  Interactive work for students and outcomes.

• Pilot project, generate baseline data
  Put an administrator on it
  Effectiveness of communication, assessment, and technology
  Use experts to structure assessment piece - build horse and cart at same time
  Evidence to move forward

About use of technology

How will technology be used and infused in pedagogy? Online tutorials. Technology immersion.
More than PowerPoint.

Pedagogical difference due to technology
  Many courses taught by lecturers – need to consider.
  4 courses - buy in from faculty
  Sounding board, core faculty to do some research. Core and large groups to follow through

• Literature review about technology in the area - English, Philosophy, etc.
  Student learning, challenges across faculty

• Campus wide deployment of learning objects and usage of technology
  Perhaps gaps exist!

Try to propagate best practices. Leadership and passion is behind best practices - It is the people
First change – pedagogy and student success, then technology – Use early adopters

Core faculty have to do assessment as well
Selection of faculty - Who?
Provost, Deans, Chairs
Need criteria for faculty selection – ATAC to develop.

Subgroup of ATAC to select faculty
  (Chair of Senate)
  (Marshelle, Otto, Harry, Joe)

Core faculty will play a leadership role
Disciplinary colleagues

Need for dissemination of information regarding grants from last year.
(Different issue) Recommend students on ATAC to Gary Reichard

**Policies for online degree programs**

Survey, Delivery - incoherent
Does CSU want to expand online?
  How? And do market analysis?
Need and success?
RFP for market analysis sent out.
Where should CSU invest money?
Identify policy issues - ATAC - think and provide guidance
Support for campuses
Population may not be able to come to campus (working and out of area)

How many online programs do we have?

Populations not now served well.
Programs versus courses (campuses only)

Appropriate populations served

Statewide vs. extension (as a business)
Which campuses to offer online program?
Underserved - not getting education versus Univ. of Phoenix
Apply to hybrid programs as well
  UG or G or International

Online will be worldwide -broadband.
What about the support structure?
Advising, library etc.

Why is CO looking at it?
Not campuses
  Collaborative Inter campus effort
  Populations not currently served such as the military, NE CA, Low flexibility students, those that cannot attend, Univ. of Phoenix students etc.

  23 campuses vs. CSU online campus is not accredited and does not have faculty

Does system have money to serve underserved populations?
WASC criteria for online programs. Need substantive change.
A list with Gerry.
And faculty and student workload issues and support?

- Need WASC requirements
- Support and faculty – capacity review

Approving - process and criteria for allowing individual campuses to offer programs. New approval process

- $30M tied to existing technology needs on campuses
- Need to have strategic thinking
- Central vs. decentralized campus programs
- Effectiveness and efficiency (system view)

- What about program transformation? Faculty mobility.
  - Campus autonomy should be respected.
  - Contractual Arrangements - CFA-CSU
  - Campus based programs
  - Student should have option of what they want to take? Online vs. other
  - AACSB - AQ-PQ not contractually bound.
  - Need and assured quality. Market analysis
  - Facilitate collaborative relationships between CSU’s.

Incentive for collaboration

Who owns the content that will be delivered?

Support structure for online degree programs

- Faculty - content and pedagogy
- Are they technology experts?
- Need significant support in the area -- Technology and infrastructure.
- Library - electronic core collection
- Core curriculum areas
- Virtual library across the CSU. Common Access
- Network medium usage, effective design of online courses and programs
- Compatibility issues
- ‘ISP’ - support

It has to be seamless

Fees and for what? Accessibility.
GE for intercampus collaborations
GE is lower division
Collaborate with Community Colleges
Policy and strategy recommendations to Gary

Students to allow into online degree programs

- Different tiers
- CSU policy or not
- State supported vs. self-support or general fund - this is where it will have an impact
- Role of cannibalism
- 150,000 degrees in another 15 years
- Not just online but hybrid
- Capital to technology investment
- Not really a substitute for faculty-student interaction

**ATAC Charge**
• Website updated
• Initial charge - 2000AD

• Revise charge
• Next - December 13     LAX Crowne Plaza
• Subcommittee to change charge and operating principles
• Harry and Bob Buckley, and Gerry Hanley

**Budget Planning - $30 M**

• July 1, 2008 - will obtain more support for moving campus forward in technology
  Depends upon Sacramento: $30M
  Is it an appropriate strategic direction?
• Infrastructure housed in CO's office
  Difficult logistics - shift in focus
  What about ROI for $30m?
  CO’s office will take few dollars in comparison to monies given to campuses

  Group of 4 Provosts (Technology Oriented) and 4 CIO's (Academic Oriented)

End of semester – Have an Academic Technology Framework

  Allocation of funds to campus - methodology
  • Assessment of current status in academic technology. Campus Self Assessment
  • Gap is what they would request funds for?
  • More strategic process
  • 3% -> 4% compact
  • Academic Infrastructure - 21st Century
  • Faculty Training is part of it

• Template developed
  Some accountability or strings attached by the legislature
  • Applications of the technology

Baseline infrastructure addition