

eLearning Committee Minutes

Present: Bryan Smith, Joni Torsella, Ash Reddy, Tina Meagher, Dave Rathbun, Deb Brandenburg, Kent Meloy, Chris Edwards, Rafael Castaneda, Chan Venkatesh, BJ Zirger, Julie Breen, Steve McKinney, Eugene Rutz, Greg Lloyd, Paul Foster, Josh Heinrich, Emanuel Lewis, Melody Clark, JP Leong, Mike Mitchum, Sue Trakas, Dawn Clineman, Pat Reid, Susana Luzuriaga, Don Hodges

Apologies: Michelle Conda, Warren Huff, Bill Nicholson, Matt Rota, Leslie Schick, Sara Schroeder, Kate York

Date: Wednesday, March 2, 2015

Time: 8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

Location: University Hall, Room 450

1. Review and approve minutes (Joni Torsella)
 - a. Vernon Jackson's name needs to be removed from LTS team in February minutes.
 - b. Committee motioned to approve the minutes with the change; the motion passed with a unanimous vote.
2. Welcome New Graduate Students, Asrith Reddy and Chan Venkatesh (Chris Edwards)
 - a. Ash Reddy and Chan Venkatesh introduced themselves followed by eLearning committee introductions.
3. CET&L Vision (Bryan Smith)
 - a. Bryan Smith shared his vision for the CET&L and collaboration plans with various partners on campus. See attached presentation.
4. New IT@UC Governance Steering Group Process (Chris Edward and Joni Torsella)
 - a. IT Council is evolving into more of a decision making body and less reporting. Topical committee co-chairs will act as advisory committee for IT Council for new initiatives. Co-chairs will meet as often as bi-weekly. The eLearning committee will draft new issues and send them to the co-chairs advisory group for vetting, and when approved, will pass on to IT Council. eLearning committee has three topics in process:

eLearning Committee

Committee Chair
Chris Edwards
AVP, eLearning, UCIT
edwardcp@ucmail.uc.edu
(513) 558-5233

Committee Co-Chair
Joni Torsella
Assoc. Professor, CEAS
torselja@ucmail.uc.edu
(513) 556-1224

Committee Members
Deb Brandenburg
Julie Breen
Melody Clark
Dawn Clineman
Michelle Conda
Paul Foster
Don Hodges
Warren Huff
JP Leong
Emanuel Lewis
Susana Luzuriaga
Steve McKinney
Tina Meagher
Delmer (Bill) Nicholson
Pam Rankey
Dave Rathbun
Pat Reid
Matt Rota
Eugene Rutz
Leslie Schick
Sara Schroeder
Bryan Smith
Kate York
BJ Zirger

Ex Officio Members
Ruth Benander
Rafael Castaneda
Jason Green
Vernon Jackson
Kent Meloy
Mike Mitchum

Students
Asrith Reddy (G)
Chan Venkatesh (G)

Meeting Schedule:
Committee meets the first
Wednesday of the month:
April 6, 2016

- i. Online Learning Success initiative
 - ii. eTextbook task force
 - iii. LMS Roadmap task force.
- b. Committee members need clear information and adequate time to fully vet issues in eLearning committee and within their own organizations before a vote takes place or before it moves to the next step of the governance process.
- c. Not all eLearning issues that come up in committee will move to the advisory group.
- d. **The Office of the Provost's site needs to be updated to reflect the advisory group and their role in the governance process.**

Advisory committee needs to set a timeline across all governance committees that states that all new issues need to come in at least a week in advance of the topical committee meetings to allow for adequate processing time. No votes will take place without adequate notice.

5. Focus Groups Update (Paul Foster, Marie Knecht)

- a. 1300 survey responses validated in 5 focus groups. All focus groups have taken place except UCBA. Student focus group was not well attended.
- b. See Paul for the questions asked in focus groups.
- c. There was good feedback and engagement from the groups and some pushback on data.
- d. One note of importance was that there is not great awareness of eLearning tools that are available, e.g., 24/7 chat capability.
- e. Faculty want to ensure that they are involved in the processes along the way.
- f. Need clarity on terminology.
- g. Next steps: Draft a final report to send to Eileen Stremmel, Vice Provost, hold celebratory luncheon and meet with pseudo focus groups that have touchpoints with eLearning, e.g. Caroline Miller.
- h. Rob Rokey is chair again of Faculty Senate IT, and they will help develop strategies around the 10 recommendations from the strategic plan.

6. LMS Roadmap Task Force Update (attached issue-action form-Paul Foster)

- a. Co-chairs, Greg Lloyd and Paul Foster
- b. Greg & Paul will submit the current motion and supporting letter to the steering committee/Advisory Council for IT Council, with the goal of obtaining IT Council's endorsement of the overall process.
- c. Greg and Paul will work with Faculty Senate, the colleges, and IT Council to identify additional representatives to serve on the LMS Roadmap Task Force (e.g., faculty members, CET&L, students, UC Libraries, & Risk Management).
- d. Should IT Council endorse the overall strategy and process, the LMS Roadmap Task Force will work with Marie's team to create a messaging strategy. This is in an effort to dispel any FUD.
- e. Should the LMS Roadmap Task Force recommend conducting a pilot after completing a market scan and consulting with peer institutions, we will to return to the governance structure with:
 - i. The rationale for why a particular LMS platform was recommended for a pilot
 - ii. Estimated costs of that pilot
 - iii. What criteria will be used to determine whether the pilot is successful
- f. Any recommendation to conduct a pilot will be shared with governance well in advance of a scheduled vote, so that members of the committee have time to understand and consult with their college or unit.

- g. At next month's eLearning Committee meeting, the LMS Roadmap Task Force will share an update on the process and follow up discussions with Blackboard.
- h. **Motion to endorse strategy developed by LMS Task Force; motion passed with no opposition or abstentions.**
 - i. Need another step inserted POST IT Council step that would explicitly articulate the process to the stakeholders.
 - ii. Investigate other recommendations and add additional institutional representative membership
 - iii. Vet the whole process with WebEx like data (matrix, pilot, etc.)
 - iv. Not asking for funding for products but for staff and vendor travel time

7. Podcast Producer/Mediasite Migration (attached issue-action form-Tina Meagher)

- a. Sent communication to tech contacts using the legacy systems (Podcast Producer and MediaSite)
- b. Receiving good feedback about the main issue which is the 99% captioning rate and \$1.5 per minute rate. CEAS has extensive video that needs captioned.
- c. Public facing video and courses that move to future semesters is recommended to be captioned at the 99% level.
- d. Video and Digital Media Subcommittee is asking for eLearning committee to endorse a common sense practice to be approved through the governance process for captioning videos that need to be migrated from legacy systems.
- e. Colleges will make the ultimate decision about what data will be migrated and the level of captioning, except for public facing video for old legacy systems. Public facing video must be captioned at or above 90% level to meet 504/508 accessibility requirements.
- f. All other issues around captioning will be addressed once the Accessibility project kicks off campus-wide.
- g. One option is to use free 70% mechanical captioning and then departments can manually caption video up to the required level.
- h. Mandatory captioning is funded out of a UC central fund, not by departments.
- i. Tina will add more college representatives to the Video and Digital Media subcommittee so that all colleges are appropriately represented.
- j. No motion or vote is required today.
- k. Funding has been allocated from the Provost's Office for the campus-wide Accessibility project, which will include a project manager (PM). Ron Rateau, SA Disability Services, and the PM will lead the project. Will also request a new position in CET&L to support Accessibility.
- l. **Next steps: Invite Ron Rateau to April eLearning Committee meeting for update on Accessibility project.**

8. Enabling Automatic Mechanical Closed Captioning in Echo360 ALP

- a. **Tina will write a communication about captioning to be sent to the group in preparation for discussion in the April eLearning committee meeting.**

9. AVP for Innovations and Partnership Search Status (Chris Edwards)

- a. Skype interviews were completed last Friday (2/26) and the pool of applicants has been narrowed to five (5) candidates, who will be coming to campus for in-person interviews.

10. Subcommittee and Project Updates (see attached forms)

- a. ID/P subcommittee update: Plan to provide a full set of training that will be offered throughout the campuses at different locations based upon high-need/high-use, based on CET&L evidence based learning. Pat will provide a tentative schedule with potential topics at next ID/P meeting. Units will have opportunity to provide feedback on high-needs, high-use training requirements. **Pat will send the list to the ID/P subcommittee prior to the 3/18 meeting.**
- b. ePortfolio update: Pam Rankey provided a brief update about the ePortfolio summit that was held 2/22/2016. Pat Reid and Jason Day are joining the ePortfolio task force. See Ruth's detailed update (attached) for more information.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 am.

ELEARNING COMMITTEE ISSUE/ACTION FORM

AGENDA ITEM: LMS ROADMAP TASK FORCE UPDATE INITIATOR: PAUL FOSTER & GREG LLOYD

Check Here if Action Item X

Check Here if Discussion Item X

Date of Meeting: 3/2/2016 Estimated Time Needed @ Meeting 15 Minutes

I. ISSUE/QUESTION/PROBLEM:

Review and discuss the recommendations made by the LMS Roadmap Task Force following the recent Academic Technology Planning (ATP) engagement with Blackboard.

II. BACKGROUND DATA:

UC recently hosted Blackboard for a three-day Academic Technology Planning (ATP) engagement, which largely focused on the roadmap for their core LMS product. Following this engagement, Bb's CEO and CFO visited UC to respond to many of the concerns that were raised during the ATP engagement.

The LMS Roadmap Task Force has reviewed several reports from Gartner, discussed the results of the ATP engagement, and also looked at an early version of Blackboard Ultra. As a result of this work, the Task Force is making several recommendations that are detailed in the attached letter.

III. ACTION OPTIONS AVAILABLE:

Option A.

Option B.

Option C.

IV. RECOMMENDED OPTION WITH RATIONALE AND IMPLICATIONS:

Endorse the recommended course of action by the LMS Roadmap Task Force. If the members of the eLearning Committee agree, the recommendation will next go to IT Council for their endorsement. Should IT Council also endorse the recommendation, the LMS Roadmap Task Force will return to the IT governance structure in two to three months with a recommendation about whether to continue to with Blackboard or pilot test an alternative LMS platform.

V. DISPOSITION (WHO DOES WHAT, WHEN) INCLUDING TIME FRAME:

VI. MOTION:

2ND BY (MEMBER MAY BE IDENTIFIED AT THE MEETING): _____

(Submit to Jane Haniefy, combsjl@ucmail.uc.edu by 5 p.m. the Wednesday before the meeting.)

ELEARNING COMMITTEE ISSUE/ACTION FORM

AGENDA ITEM: CAPTIONING FOR MEDIASITE/PODCAST PRODUCER CONVERTED VIDEOS

INITIATOR: PAUL FOSTER &

TINA MEAGHER

Check Here if Action Item

Check Here if Discussion Item

Date of Meeting: 3/2/16

Estimated Time Needed @ Meeting 15 minutes

- ISSUE/QUESTION/PROBLEM:**

The university lacks a common sense practice, endorsed by the community through shared governance, for captioning video converted/migrated from legacy video systems.

- BACKGROUND DATA:**

CEeL needs to ensure that the University is compliant with the requirements of sections 504/508 of the Rehabilitation Act and AADA as they pertain to the enterprise video tools within the Canopy ecosystem. As we began planning for the sunset of the MediaSite and Podcast Producer systems, colleges were informed that any video content that resided on the MediaSite/Podcast Producer systems that they wanted to migrate would need to be converted/captioned. The most critical videos to caption are those that will be accessible to the general public. Next to be captioned are videos that will be used across multiple terms, disciplines and courses. Lastly, general purpose videos, such as feedback to students or video discussion board posts, should be captioned at the discretion of the colleges.

Echo360 is UC's official lecture capture system and Kaltura is UC's official video repository and content creation tool. Video content from legacy lecture capture systems like MediaSite and Podcast Producer will need to be converted/migrated into Kaltura or Echo360. We have requested that colleges assist their faculty in selecting content for conversion/migration. Further, we have provided colleges with examples of the content types appropriate for conversion/migration.

In order to comply with our legal obligations for content available to the public, videos must be captioned with an accuracy exceeding 95%. Colleges would be responsible for the cost of professional level captioning for their public-facing content at the cost of \$1.50 a media minute.

Summary of meeting with Derek Niewahner and Eugene Rutz: The College of Engineering & Applied Sciences has in excess of 750 hours of video, used in their online courses and in introductory courses for high school students. Eugene and Derek agreed that the public-facing videos should be professionally captioned, however they also asserted that it would not be cost effective to caption videos that will be recreated with in the next year.

If a student has an accommodation requiring closed captioning, then the college will work with the Disability Services Office to caption videos.

- ACTION OPTIONS AVAILABLE:**

Option A.

Option B.

Option C.

- RECOMMENDED OPTION WITH RATIONALE AND IMPLICATIONS:**

We are requesting the eLearning Committee endorse a common sense practice for captioning of video converted/migrated from legacy video systems that will be sent through the shared governance process.

• **DISPOSITION (WHO DOES WHAT, WHEN) INCLUDING TIME FRAME:**

VI. **MOTION:**

2ND BY (MEMBER MAY BE IDENTIFIED AT THE MEETING): _____

(Submit to Jane Haniefy, combsjl@ucmail.uc.edu by 5 p.m. the Wednesday before the meeting.)

To: eLearning Committee, IT Council

From: LMS Roadmap Task Force
Paul Foster (co-chair)
Greg Lloyd (co-chair)

Date: February 23, 2016

Subject: Academic Technology Planning engagement with Blackboard

Summary

As part of the eLearning Strategic Planning process, UCIT facilitated a three-day Academic Technology Planning (ATP) engagement with representatives from Blackboard. Fifty-three members from the UC community participated in at least one of the sessions, while the members of the LMS Roadmap Task Force participated during all three days. Following the recent ATP engagement, Blackboard's CEO and CFO are scheduled to visit UC and meet with key leadership on February 25, 2016.

The discussions during the ATP between the UC community and the team from Blackboard were very candid in nature, with a great deal of emphasis being placed on Blackboard's next generation LMS platform, Blackboard Ultra. In an effort to better understand the impact that Blackboard Ultra might have for UC, the team from Blackboard conducted a brainstorming session to identify current and future learning scenarios at UC. Those learner scenarios ranged from the more effective use of the Discussion Board to utilizing Blackboard Ultra as a workforce development platform. A summary of the learning scenarios and associated recommendations from Blackboard are included in their report.

In the three weeks following the ATP, additional discussions were held with the LMS Roadmap Task Force, the Instructional Design & Pedagogy subcommittee, the eLearning Committee, and staff in the Center for Excellence in eLearning. A broad consensus has emerged from those discussions:

- **No clear path to Ultra** – It is unclear when and how UC can move to Blackboard's next generation platform. Ultra is now more than a year overdue, and Blackboard's strategy surrounding Ultra has changed. For example, Blackboard has announced their intent to implement several of the planned Ultra features (responsive design, competency based education, improved instructor workflows) in their 9.x product line (which UC currently uses). However, self-hosted schools will be receiving access to the improvements in 9.x and Ultra well after Blackboard's SaaS customers.
- **Viability of Blackboard as a company** – There exist significant concerns about the viability of Blackboard as a company (e.g., high debt, rumors of an impending sale of the company, several rounds of layoffs, a recent CEO change, customer defections to other LMS platforms, etc.). At least part of the reason for the visit by Blackboard's CEO & CFO is to reassure UC about the state of the company.

- **Current 9.x design is dated** – The ease of use and functionality in Blackboard 9.x is perceived by UC students and faculty to be not as good as other platforms such as Instructure’s Canvas. For example, the current Blackboard interface is not based on responsive design, but rather is based on out-of-date web standards, and is correspondingly difficult to navigate. Further, Blackboard’s support for mobile devices lags behind other LMS vendors.
- **Lack of innovation** – Very little innovation has emerged from Blackboard in recent years. Based on what was shared during the ATP engagement, the company’s strategy is to focus on implementing many of the current Blackboard 9.x features in Blackboard Ultra. However, they appear uncommitted to (and may possibly remove) specific features that are critical to UC students and faculty, such as Inline Grading via Crocodoc integration. Additionally, it’s unclear that Blackboard’s roadmap for their core platform aligns well with UC’s goals and aspirations for eLearning.

Recommendations

The LMS Roadmap Task Force reviewed the information that Blackboard shared during the ATP engagement, and also evaluated an early release of Blackboard Ultra. Many of the core features of Blackboard 9.x (e.g., tests, graded discussion forums, groups, etc.) have not yet been implemented in Blackboard Ultra. Despite the inability to fully assess Blackboard Ultra, the LMS Roadmap Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- **Role of Shared Governance** – Due to the importance and widespread usage of Blackboard, the LMS Roadmap Task Force strongly recommends that any decision about whether to remain with the Blackboard LMS, move to Blackboard’s SaaS offering, or even pilot test alternative LMS platforms should be made through the shared governance process. In particular, the LMS Roadmap Task Force recommends that at each step of the process an update be shared with both the eLearning Committee and IT Council for their review and endorsement. Should a recommendation ultimately be made to switch LMS platforms, that recommendation will likely need to go through UC’s Integrated Decision Making Process.
- **Establish a broadly representative group** – Because of the delays in the release of Blackboard Ultra, as well as significant reservations about whether that platform will meet UC’s eLearning needs, the LMS Task Force recommends expanding the current Task Force to include broad representation from faculty, students, CET&L, UC Libraries, Risk Management, and other affected units or populations. The current membership of the LMS Task Force only includes UCIT staff + instructional designers from several colleges, and so is not sufficiently representative to take on this responsibility.
- **Market scan** – Once a more representative Task Force has been formed, the LMS Roadmap Task Force recommends that it be charged with conducting a market scan to identify the leading LMS platforms, and to assess whether any of those platforms are viable for UC. The current Task Force has already consulted a market assessment prepared by Gartner to assist in identifying potential alternative LMS platforms.

- **Contact peer institutions** – The LMS Task Force also recommends contacting approximately ten peer institutions about their LMS plans, particularly those institutions (e.g., Indiana University, University of Kentucky, and Miami University) which have recently migrated LMS platforms. In preparation for those discussions, the Task Force has prepared a list of questions for each institution.
- **Potential pilot** – After conducting a market scan and assessing the potential alternative LMS platforms, the LMS Roadmap Task Force would make a recommendation to the eLearning Committee and IT Council for their review and endorsement about whether UC should commence with a formal pilot test of one or more alternative LMS platforms, or continue with Blackboard.
- **Messaging to the UC community** – Because of the significance of the Blackboard LMS platform to UC students and faculty, as well as the potential disruption that may occur should UC elect to switch LMS platforms, the LMS Task Force strongly recommends that the process by which UC assesses and evaluates its LMS platform be open and transparent. Further, it is strongly recommended that regular updates are provided to the appropriate governance committees for their review and endorsement, and that those updates be shared with the broader UC community.

Conclusion

While UC has used Blackboard as its primary LMS platform since 2001, it is unclear whether Blackboard will remain the market leader in the near future. Many schools, including several Ohio schools and peer institutions, have recently switched to other LMS platforms, particularly Instructure’s Canvas. Based on the information shared recently by Blackboard, and input from the eLearning community, the LMS Roadmap Task Force is recommending that we conduct a strategic assessment to see whether an alternative LMS platform is a better fit for UC. The LMS Roadmap Task Force further recommends that this assessment be conducted with broad representation from the UC community, that the assessment be open and transparent, and that any decisions regarding UC’s LMS be made through the shared governance process.

Respectfully submitted by the LMS Roadmap Task Force,

Paul Foster	Greg Lloyd	Tina Meagher	Don Hodges	Elicia Flom	Josh Heinrich
Julie Breen	Emanuel Lewis	Pat Reid	Jenni Jacobs	Nancy Rogers	Kuyler McComas
Robin Storch	Mike Mitchum	Emily Myers	Kent Meloy	Angie Robbins	Dawn Clineman
Dave Rathbun	Deb Brandenburg				



March Subcommittee Summary

The first meeting of the Video & Digital Media Subcommittee was held on Wednesday, February 3, 2016. Tina opened the meeting and began with member introductions. It was agreed that future meetings will be held monthly for 1.5 hours on Wednesday afternoons.

There was discussion on the draft of the Video & Digital Media subcommittee charter that Tina had previously shared. The subcommittee will initially focus on best practices for using the video tools in the classroom; however, it was agreed that there needs to be a strong focus on copyright compliance as well a clarification on content ownership and access. Tina also reviewed the subcommittee memberships and identified the voting members.

Issue Action Form – Dave is seeking support for universal mechanical captioning for all Echo360 lecture captures. The subcommittee voted to send the Issue/Action Form to the eLearning IT Governance Committee for consideration next month.

ALP update – Scheduling appears to be much improved but some would like to see the ability to do bulk uploads.

MediaSite/Podcast Producer Sunset – A Letter went out to college contacts describing the sunset process. Users will need to complete a survey monkey survey for any (purposeful) content they want to be moved. The cutoff date is end of spring semester.

Kaltura - Issues with copying recording video in Bb courses using the Mashup tool were reported. Kaltura created a script to correct the issue but you will need to go into videos and update categories. A short “how to” video showing how to correct the issue will be created.

WebEx – The CoM WebEx instance is now in place. They are currently testing an automated procedure for the WebEx connector testing. A communication has also been sent with information on how to update the productivity tools.

Video Tools Learning Community - Everyone from the previous multimedia tools groups will be included in the email list for meeting notifications.

Video and Digital Media Subcommittee - Monthly Update for eLearning Topical Committee

Tina Meagher - Co-Chair
UCIT – Senior Video Strategist
meaghecm@ucmail.uc.edu
(513)556-6378

JP Leong - Co-Chair
CECH – Multimedia Coordinator
leongjp@ucmail.uc.edu
(513)556-3607

Steve McKinney - Co-Chair
CON CATER – Comp & Info Analyst
mckinnsv@ucmail.uc.edu
(513)558-2887

Project Team Members

Kent Meloy
Emanuel Lewis
Greg Lloyd
Josh Heinrich
Elicia Flom
Christian Drennen
Matt Conley
Derek Niewahner
Emmanuel Wilson
Todd Schutter
Tom Scherz
Kevin Burke
Pam Rankey
Students Reps - TBD

Ex-Officio Members

Mike Mitchum
Steve Crump
Dave Rathbun
Tim Lawrence
Deb Brandenburg

LMS Subcommittee Monthly Update for eLearning Topical Committee

Deb Brandenburg - Co-chair

UCIT – IT Manager II
brandedh@ucmail.uc.edu
(513)556-9120

Don Hodges - Co-chair

CAHS – Director IT
hodgesdd@ucmail.uc.edu
(513)558-0431

Subcommittee Members

Jon Adams
Melanie Bauer
Julie Breen
Rachel Frankel
Vernon Jackson
Emanuel Lewis
Greg Lloyd
Lisa Padgett
Dave Rathbun
Cynthia Ris
Angie Robbins
Victoria Wangia
Student Government – TBD
GSGA – TBD
Paul Foster (IT@UC Advisor)
Jane Haniefy (PMO Advisor)
Lisa Capan (Bb Advisor)

March 2016 Subcommittee Summary:

Scheduled maintenance was performed on February 11th and included an update to the Math Placement building block to accommodate the next academic year. They also applied an update to the Kaltura building block in order to fix a number of issues, including with the Cielo24 integration. There were some problems experienced with playing videos in Blackboard that were uploaded using the Mashup tool but these problems were resolved by the administrators with assistance from the vendor.

There were no new updates on the outstanding requests in TeamDynamix. A new request was submitted by the College of Nursing to set up an SSO integration between UC's Blackboard and Sherpath, which is their module for Accelerated Fundamentals. Administrators are working to get it installed on the development server for testing.

The second meeting for the LMS Course Retention Policy Work Group was held on Tuesday, February 23rd. Meeting minutes have not yet been completed but the agenda items for that discussion included:

- I. Review and approval of the 1/28/16 Meeting Notes
- II. Review of the Proposed Policy
- III. Discussion of Concerns at the College, Unit, and Department Levels
- IV. Communication Plan Development
- V. Conclusion and Review of Action Times



March 2016 Project Team Summary

The sub-committee continued work on template/recommended language to help make the submission of new online program proposals (those that have to be addressed to meet OBR approval) consistent and more efficient for all academic units.

Completed Items

- Template content drafted; currently under review and revision.

Outstanding Items

- Final draft will be presented to IT Governance eLearning Committee in April.

Monthly Update Online Learning Sub-Committee

Melody Clark, Co-lead/Co-chair
Director, DL and CE

Eugene Rutz, Co-lead/Co-chair
Director, CEAS DL

eLearning Backpack Project Team - Monthly Update for eLearning Topical Committee

March Project Team Summary

The February Backpack community of practice (CoP) meeting was held on Friday, February 19 at UC Blue Ash. There were 16 people in attendance – 2 from cohort 1 and 14 from cohort 2. The meeting was recorded and is available in the Backpack organization on Blackboard.

Juan Antonio Islas Munos provided an online demo of how to use the Wacom tablet, including the basic setup and tablet properties. The use of the iPad Pro has been tested this term by a couple participants. There was a lot of discussion following the presentation on the possible use of the iPad Pro versus the Wacom Tablet. The iPad Pro is more portable and easier to use, but there are some specific use cases that are best supported by using the Wacom and Camtasia software.

Mike provided a report on the surveys from the early term feedback. Overall results were overwhelmingly positive (see attached chart). Based on the feedback, students are not necessarily looking for more technology in the classroom. Some students are actually happy with the way the classrooms are currently structured – the use of Kaltura video has been very well received. Students have also appreciated getting video feedback from their instructors.

Discussions have been held on the planning for Cohort 3 of the eLearning Backpack Project. More information will be forthcoming.

Deb has been working with one of the web designers in the PIO to help update and redesign the Backpack web pages. A meeting is planned for the first week of March to see the mockup.

The March CoP meeting will be held at UC Clermont on the 18th in 105 McDonough Hall at 12:00 noon.

Outstanding Items:

- Work with Marie on communication plan for late March or early April.
- Identify and convene selection committee for Cohort 3 in April.
- Order preliminary equipment for Cohort 3 in April.
- Make selections and communicate awards prior to summer semester, allowing for better faculty preparation for fall semester.
- Combine the May kickoff meeting for Cohort 3 with the celebration meeting for Cohort 2 (mini-conference) to help generate more enthusiasm for the project.

Deb Brandenburg - Co-lead
UCIT – IT Manager II
brandedh@ucmail.uc.edu
(513)556-9120

Mike Mitchum - Co-lead
UCIT – Team Lead,
Information Tech Analyst
mitchuml@ucmail.uc.edu
(513)556-9259

Project Team Members

Ben Hutchison
Dave Rathbun
Tina Meagher

March 2016 Project Team Summary

Completed Items

- ePortfolio Summit held on February 22, 2016
- ePortfolio Theory Seminar held on February 22, 2016
- ePortfolio Application Workshop held on February 25, 2016

Outstanding Items

- Create a special edition of the UC SoTL journal, *The Journal for Research and Practice in College Teaching*, to cover case studies of eportfolio implementation at UC.
- Hold the second UC ePortfolio Summit during the UCIT Technology Showcase/AFTL Teaching Showcase in 2017.
- Create eportfolio workshops and seminars to support eportfolio implementation through the CETL and the UCBA Learning and Teaching Center.
- Jason Day and Pat Reid will be joining the ePortfolio Task Force as new members.
- Current membership of the Task Force: Ruth Benander, Brenda Refaei, Rich Robles Debbie Brawn

Overview of ePortfolios at the University of Cincinnati

February 22, 2016

Next steps:

Create a special edition of the UC SoTL journal, *The Journal for Research and Practice in College Teaching*, to cover case studies of eportfolio implementation at UC.

Hold the second UC ePortfolio Summit during the UCIT Technology Showcase/AFTL Teaching Showcase in 2017.

Create eportfolio workshops and seminars to support eportfolio implementation through the CETL and the UCBA Learning and Teaching Center.

Jason Day and Pat Reid will be joining the ePortfolio Task Force as new members.

Current membership of the Task Force: Ruth Benander, Brenda Refaei, Rich Robles Debbie Brawn

University Honors: Debbie Brawn

Learning portfolios in University Honors. Have been engaged since the beginning. Implemented eportfolios in fall 2007. Feels they are finally hitting their stride with eportfolios. Handouts of University wide program. They have a [website of featured learning portfolios](#) on the honors page. Develop global citizens is their goal. They begin portfolios in gateway course and students choose the platform. Create a landing page in the first year that serves as an introduction to who they are. Who is the audience for the learning portfolio? Each honors experience is showcased in the portfolio with explanation of what they did and what they learned from it. Students complete a year in review to explain what they have learned throughout the year. Honors advisors review the reflections and give students feedback and work with them to maintain the portfolio. The portfolio is a graduation requirement. Honors ambassadors offer workshops where they meet individually with students to go through how to navigate a portfolio.

Allied Health: Pamela Greenstone

Since fall 2010 the health information management program started with taskstream. Summer 2014 they moved to Livebinders. Showcase portfolios of learning outcomes mastery. At the program level, they look at learning to see what they need to do in the senior capstone course. They use portfolios for employment. The portfolios are assessed with a rubric.

Professional Practice: Rich Robles

Used in travel course, mid-career PD course, Intro to Co-op. Portfolios are required for academic internship program, civic engagement & service-learning certificates. Capstone has one credit hour to work on the portfolio. The portfolios focus on experiential reflection and includes personal and professional development. Initial findings of student perceptions show that students believe that portfolios are a good reflection of their skills. Some students in his program are in the Honors program. Issues to consider: not widely implemented, no assessment of them, prior learning assessment coming soon, need to balance qualitative eportfolio versus quantified assessment & evaluation.

Blue Ash College English: Brenda Refaei and Ruth Benander

English courses use eportfolios, according to faculty choice, from basic writing courses through intermediate composition courses. Lower levels use Google Sites, and more advanced levels use Weebly and WordPress, although students are free to choose another platform if they prefer. ePortfolios are used for course and program assessment, and they are assessed using purpose appropriate rubrics. Student portfolio samples are available on [college website](#).

Clermont College English: Sharon Burns

WordPress is the most commonly used platform with Weebly a close second. They talk about eportfolios during their composition roundtables. Worked with instructors to develop their skills to implement eportfolios. There are pockets of eportfolios around Clermont College.

Doctorate of Nursing Program: Missi Stec

Evernote is the platform. They wanted to track competencies using eportfolios. They mapped competencies to courses and specific assignments within the courses. Evernote is used for submitting assignments. Uses Evernote for class notes. Evernote is also used for portfolio. They have a working portfolio where they keep everything and is tagged with specific competencies. Students also make a formal portfolio. Working with 100 students and will be rolling out to masters students. Every student has an iPad. The students and faculty pay for Evernote premium. Evernote allows for real time feedback. Final portfolio is a graduation requirement. Does a four hour training on how to use Evernote with students.

Clermont Health Information Systems: Darlene Foltz and Karen Lankisch

This is an online program. It's a competency based program. Started with 6 students. They have 120 students now. Just starting eportfolios with LiveBinders and have moved to Weebly. They start the portfolio in their first year course and then they are supposed to load in their work from their courses as they go along through the program. Purpose is to be able to reflect on where they started and ended. Second is to consider using it with employers. Credentials are more important than sharing a portfolio.

Bachelor of Technical and Applied Studies Program: Pam Rankey and Michele Kegley

Started with thinking about using eportfolios for assessment. Started with LiveBinders. They thought about some core documents to have included in the portfolio. Started working what they wanted at the capstone course. They decided at UCBA to allow students to choose the platform they wanted. Pam started with a introduction to the program and introduction to eportfolio. Uses a link in Blackboard for portfolio instruction. Trying to emphasize to implement eportfolio throughout the program. They found having training session on WordPress that really helped.

ePortfolio Summit Brainstorming Session

Platform

- What are the "preferred" platforms? Who decides what those platforms are? What is the role of the ePortfolio Task Force in this decision?
- How can UC negotiate with "preferred" platforms to ensure that students have continued access as they transfer to their professional career? In addition, how can UC negotiate with these platforms financially so that the platforms remain "free" and without advertisements?
- Will platform support be dynamic, meaning, how do we keep up as new, better platforms come to light and previous platforms fall behind?
- What kind of IT support can UCIT offer students in preferred platforms?
- How can programs network to support one another in development and implementation?

- Can links for student eportfolio samples be made available in the Catalyst?
- Can a link to a student eportfolio be linked to student/staff directory “business card”?
- Where else can we continue to expand student and faculty showcase eportfolios with employer audiences?
- How can we provide just in time platform instruction in classes?

Assessment

- How do we cultivate/prioritize rubric development for programs vs. General Education rubrics?
- How can we communicate guidelines for program level standards?
- Can we have a more consistent use of the word “assessment” and how it is applied across colleges and departments?
- Is it possible to have staff to support assessment work such as data entry?
- What are the standardized rubrics that we could use for general education assessment?
- How can assessment of eportfolios be used, such as for the Higher Learning Commission, University General Education, or other institution wide initiatives?

Development

- How can we fund workshops and travel to conferences for adjunct faculty, advisors, and student affairs staff?
- How can we advertise workshops and conferences better for all students, faculty, and staff?
- What speakers can we bring in such as John Zubizarreta to focus on reflection and whole student development?
- Who can build training videos or just in time instruction for basics for students and faculty?
- How can we accommodate students at different level and different backgrounds in introducing and cultivating eportfolios?
- Can we offer workshops on these topics?
 - Copyright law and eportfolios
 - Eportfolio theory and self-authorship
 - Eportfolio development of the whole student
- How to create good reflective assignments that help students more than just summarize
- How to assess eportfolios both course based and capstone eportfolio

Big Questions

- What kind of funding is available for the eportfolio initiative?
- Where can we archive eportfolios for assessment?
- Can we create an executive summary of research articles that outline best practices and proof of value for eportfolios?
- What are the FERPA and HIPPA implications for the use of eportfolios?
- How can we understand the evolution of paradigms where personal/professional person, the digital self are less and less differentiated and instead are part of the holistic self?
- How can we negotiate the tension between portability and public access with issues of privacy?
- Is it possible to create a consistent lexis across the university for eportfolios?
- Given disparities of technological experience and access, how can we differentiate competency vs. growth such as the accomplishments of digital natives vs. digital newcomers