SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTFOLIO
DATE: September 27, 2017
TIME: 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Marriott Library, MLIB 5201

IN ATTENDANCE:
Martha Bradley  Randy Dryer  Nancy Lombardo  Harish Maringhanti
Ryan Steele  Wayne Samuelson  Jon Thomas  Patrick Tripeny

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Paul Burrows, Emily Rushton

UNABLE TO ATTEND:
Rick Ash  Zach Berger  Patrick Panos  Eric Poitras
Fernando Rubio  Cory Stokes

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:
• Learning Spaces update and details
• Faculty awareness of services available
• Demo of potential tool: Mediaspace
• Review of current Teaching and Learning Technologies website
• Discuss experience of teaching in new pod-based classrooms

Learning Spaces update and details

Paul Burrows, TLT information architect, gave this update. The process is being compressed from 20 weeks to 10 weeks, primarily to meet a new requirement that all award recommendations should be finished by March 15, 2018 to align with the overall University budget season. This year, task force interviews will be optional instead of required. Additionally, groups requesting funding will need to itemize everything. If they cannot itemize a request, Burrows said they’ll be encouraged to ask for that in their overall budget request from the University (rather than Learning Spaces). Otherwise, the process is largely staying the same.

It was clarified that due to the decision made in SITC, the task force would no longer be an awarding body, but a recommending one, and would still need to budget award amounts down to the dollar.

Burrows walked through the remaining timeline and showed where the Learning Spaces funding documents will be kept. Due to the retirement of Equella, which is where the application form used in the 2016-17 funding process was hosted, that form will no longer be available. Burrows is exploring other options but in the meantime, since the timeline is so compressed, he has created an Excel-based spreadsheet to mimic the online form groups requesting funds have become familiar with. He explained this will be the fallback solution used for groups requesting funds if another solution isn’t identified before the application process begins.
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**Faculty awareness of services available**

TLT director Jon Thomas gave an overview of the many teaching tools available to instructors, most of which are integrated with the University’s learning management system, Canvas, including Kaltura, Cielo24, SmarterProctoring, and ConexED, as well as additional tools being considered for purchase. Thomas explained his concern that faculty may not be aware of the tools currently being offered, citing an only 63% adoption rate of Canvas as an example.

Thomas then asked the group for their own ideas and perspectives on how to encourage instructors to begin using the tools available to them, and facilitated this discussion with an activity in which portfolio members wrote down as many ideas as they could in three minutes, using individual Post-It notes.

One suggestion was to decode the lingo around the various tools, and move away from using product names to describe a specific service. Instructors might want the results of the tool, but they don’t know which tool offers those results. Instead of TLT offering a list of tools instructors may or may not recognize, instructors should be asked what they’re looking for to enhance or improve upon their teaching. As one member said, alerting faculty to new technology isn’t a bad thing, but it’s not the only feasible way to encourage faculty to start using available tools. There was general agreement in the room on this. One member suggested TLT ask to be added to college council agendas as a way to let faculty know some of the tools already available to them.

The discussion shifted to Canvas and understanding why 37% of faculty haven’t adopted it as their primary learning management system tool. One member suggested identifying which types of classes are not using Canvas to see if there’s a trend amongst areas of study, and Thomas agreed and said better metrics are needed.

Finally, there was a brief discussion on how and why certain tools were chosen for purchase, with the eventual clarification that most current tools went through an approval process with the Integrated Student Team (IST) (in lieu of the current governance process with SITC/ANTC, which didn’t exist at the time of consideration).

**Demo of potential tool: MediaSpace**

Adam Stewart, TLT associate director, did a walkthrough of MediaSpace, which is a tool that integrates with the Kaltura video streaming tool in Canvas. Kaltura has two ways for users to access videos: My Media, and MediaSpace. MediaSpace looks very similar to My Media, but is available and accessible outside of Canvas. Stewart explained the various tabs in the interface (My Media, My Playlists, etc.) and showed how an instructor could create a channel for students to access outside of Canvas. One member asked how this differed from creating a dedicated YouTube channel, and Stewart said while the two are similar, videos hosted in MediaSpace are in a secure University environment with which a
business associates agreement (BAA) exists. This isn’t the case with YouTube. Stewarts clarified that while the content can be accessed outside of Canvas, the user still needs to log in with his/her uNID and password to access the shared channel.

Stewart said they’re also planning on having a main landing page for the homescreen, which will feature University-wide content, a video gallery, TLT trainings and tutorials, and so on. One member suggested having a “help” or “start here” button for newcomers.

The portfolio spent some time discussing use cases for MediaSpace. One popular idea was to let MediaSpace be a centralized repository for super users, including TLT tutorials for the various tools offered to instructors. TLT will explore this idea in the future.

**Review of current Teaching and Learning Technologies website**

Thomas walked through the new TLT website and asked the portfolio for initial feedback. Suggestions included replacing technical jargon with language faculty will understand, adding clarifying language explaining what differentiates TLT’s services from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE), and having clearer help content for specific needs (the example one member gave was how to develop a hybrid course).

The discussion shifted briefly to the ongoing challenge of successfully communicating to faculty. The administration’s recent transition away from DMail has made it that much harder to reach faculty, and one member offered to present this as a topic to SITC.

**Discuss experience of teaching in new pod-based classrooms**

Patrick Tripeny, Director for the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) and professor in the College of Architecture, told the group about a recent teaching experience. Tripeny has taught in the same auditorium-style classroom for over 20 years, and over the last few years, he’s had trouble motivating students to collaboratively learn and work together in that teaching space. Recently, his college converted an old computer room into a collaborative 30-person classroom. His dean asked if he’d be willing to try teaching in it, but Tripeny had initial concerns of the room being too small for his class size of 47 students. However, while teaching one day, one of Tripeny’s students – who uses a wheelchair and sits in the designated ADA space – pointed out that working with other students wasn’t an option for him/her in particular, as he/she was confined to the ADA space.

This situation, combined with Tripeny’s students’ overall lack of willingness to collaborate, finally convinced him to try out the smaller collaborative classroom. The students complained for a couple of weeks, but Tripeny said eventually, they got used to it. With the help of TLT, he uses a document camera now. He’s no longer the center of attention in the classroom, and his students are paying more...
attention to what he’s saying and what he’s writing on the document screen. In his own words, “For the first time, they are working together.” This same group of students has been meeting in Tripeny’s class since January 2017 (a year-long class rather than one semester). Since January, this is the first time his students have willingly collaborated and worked with each other, asking each other questions instead of immediately asking Tripeny. “I just never realized how disadvantaged I was by that lecture room,” he said.

The group began to discuss the ways in which classrooms are built, and how they can potentially be hindering instructors’ ability to teach. One member pointed out that the fact that Tripeny’s new classroom is so small, and so crowded, could lend to making people feel more comfortable (in comparison to the same format in a larger room, which might not provide the same results). Another member said he’s found that his students are more comfortable talking in groups of four or five, versus speaking up in a very large class. The group discussed the positive effect of classroom features such as multiple monitors on different walls, movable furniture, and in general designing classrooms in such a way that encourages movement and collaboration. Finally, one member suggested turning Tripeny’s case study into a video produced by TLT and hosted on MediaSpace to encourage faculty to try out this classroom format.