

Report of the ITPB Workgroup on Common Collaboration and Learning Environment (CCLE)
Recommendations
April 23, 2008

“The FCET [Faculty Committee on Educational Technology] believes that our students now require a consistent, powerful, and transparent application of our educational technology applications across disciplines and across the campus. Select a single application to support collaboration and teaching tools for instructional, research and administrative groups. The FCET based this recommendation for a single application on a set of principles and goals, some of which are included in this summary. They call for a commitment to providing an integrated environment as an institution-wide service that supports local customization and end-user service. The FCET core assumption is that such a service would be made available to any individual or unit that chose to use it.” *FCET, Spring 2005 recommendation to Information Technology Planning Board (ITPB).*

“The Board also agreed that the work plan proposed by the FCET could move forward if the terminology ‘single application’ is amended to ‘shared framework’.” *ITPB Minutes, Nov 2005*

“In summary, the FSG [Functional Support Group] and TSG [Technical Support Group] jointly recommend that UCLA converge on a single open source platform as the standard campus solution for the CCLE course/collaboration tools. The platform should conform to all of the principles set forth in this report. During the convergence phase, significant efforts should be made to guarantee interoperability between the selected platform and other systems extant at UCLA that are critical to the wide-spread adoption of the CCLE. We further recommend that the FCET periodically review the CCLE to ensure that the goals outlined in this document are being substantially met.” *Focusing Resources and Fostering Creativity, Joint Functional Sponsors Group – Technical Sponsors Group Report to the Faculty Committee on Educational Technology on the CCLE June 2006*

“Chancellor Block and I support the CITI [Committee on Information Technology Infrastructure] priorities and will provide the recommended funding over the next 18 months toward the seven highest priority projects – of which the Common Collaborative and Learning Environment (CCLE) project was ranked #2. Specifically in support of the CCLE project, I have authorized Vice Chancellor Steve Olsen to release \$311,000 during FY 2007/08. An additional \$659,000 for FY 2008/09 will be escrowed with the expectation of releasing those funds in July 2008. I have asked Associate Vice Chancellor & CIO Jim Davis and the Office of Information Technology to be responsible for the campus oversight, coordination and project / process tracking associated with the reviews and release of funds on behalf of CITI and the Campus. The enclosed memo from Jim and Steve outlines the requirements for releasing the funds.” *Memo from Scott Waugh, Acting Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, to Judi Smith, Gary Strong, and Larry Loehrer. January 29, 2008.*

“We recommend that the Chancellor commit now to a total investment of \$6 million over the next 18 months in the seven highest priority projects. The remaining \$9 million should be placed in escrow to support subsequent phases of project development and implementation. This subsequent funding would be released when project plans become better defined and/or key project milestones are achieved.

Enclosed Memo from Jim Davis & Steve Olsen.

See www.oit.library.ucla/ccle for more background on the CCLE planning process and timeline

As seen from the quotes above, the vision of the CCLE was initially documented and endorsed by the FCET and the ITPB. The implementation plan developed by the CCLE Planning Team has also been reviewed and endorsed by the FCET, the ITPB, the Campus Computing Council (CCC), and the Deans Council. CITI recommended funding of the CCLE over 5 years and the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor have approved 18 months of funding, with additional funding dependent on meeting key project milestones within those 18 months.

As the operations and governance defined in implementation plan are put in place, the ITPB recommends the following issues be addressed in the first 18 months:

1. Intellectual Property

The CCLE Plan that was approved includes the following budget item: “CCLE Intellectual Property Advisor /Assistant, 1 FTE to provide assistance in dealing with intellectual property issues when adding copyrighted content as course resources. Will be administered by the Library.” The ITPB recommends that the following tasks should be priorities for that position once filled. In implementing these tasks, the ITPB also recommends that the Library work in concert with the Campus Counsel and the Office of Intellectual Property.

- a. Coordinate training activities for faculty in appropriate use of copyrighted materials for courses, with the expectation that training resources are developed that could be used by academic units and other trainers on campus. Training should include guidelines for faculty and information on student copyrights.
- b. Educate students about their own copyrights, including what they can post, what they should post, and how to protect what they post.
- c. Develop IP training modules, education tools, and documentation for incorporation into Moodle, addressed to both faculty and students.
- d. Enable faculty and students to take full advantage of the content resources we already own and license, for example by developing pilot projects to provide online course packs.
- e. Develop an ongoing communication and outreach program for faculty on the use of copyrighted material for courses, for example a series of single-topic online news blurbs on such topics as copyrighted materials, HIPAA, posting to Web sites, streaming video, etc.
- f. Experiment with Smart Software to develop a knowledge base of academic community questions on copyright, perhaps building on the questions that the Library received during its “copyright hotline” experiment.
- g. Work closely with the CCLE governance infrastructure to determine the most urgent CCLE needs in using copyrighted material and identify expertise within the CCLE and campus community that can be tapped.
- h. Review best practices for copyright education and guidelines at other universities and develop a proposed set of guidelines for UCLA faculty and students.

2. Open Coursework

The ITPB retreat identified a need for a record of instruction at UCLA be preserved for at least some time, and that UCLA consider making such records more widely available. The CCLE can be a platform for such a record. The following tasks would lay the groundwork for such a role:

- a. Establish retention guidelines for courses that will allow the CCLE to function as a record of instruction at UCLA. Courses should be retained for a minimum of 4 years.
- b. Establish appropriate access controls so that review of non-current courses can be limited as needed.

- c. Give faculty information about the potential of the CCLE as a platform for public distribution of course materials, contrasting with other avenues available to them such as iTunesU, uTubeUCLA, BruinCast, and the like.

3. Classrooms

Information technology capabilities in classrooms may affect the implementation and adoption of the CCLE. The following tasks will clarify and layout changes that are needed.

- a. Assess the impact of classroom facilities on the effective use of the CCLE for instruction.
- b. Develop a long range plan for providing IT capabilities in classrooms that provide faculty with a common experience and allow departments which support classrooms to share best practices and solutions.

4. Assessment

Ongoing planning and continued funding for the CCLE are dependent on good assessment information. The following tasks should be high priorities.

- a. Develop methods to implement Principle 4 from the CCLE Planning Team report: “The CCLE governance structure needs good information about faculty and student experience and needs to design a system that meets a broad range of academic collaboration and learning needs. Information should come from the oversight bodies (FCET, CCLE FOC, and the Deans), from faculty and student advisory groups, and from formal assessment of faculty and student experience.”
- b. The CCLE Standards and Practices Group and the CCLE Coordinator should give an annual report of the CCLE to the ITPB, the FCET, and the Dean’s Council.

5. Relationship of the CCLE to the ITPB

Since the CCLE is a strategic priority for information technology planning in the next few years, it would be desirable for CCLE and educational technology expertise to be available to the ITPB.

- a. The current Chair of the FCET should be considered as a possible member of the ITPB when new members are appointed for 2008/09.
- b. The CCLE Coordinator and the current Chair of the CCLE Standards and Practices Group should attend ITPB meetings as resources, particularly when CCLE issues are on the agenda.

Diagram of CCLE Coordination / Collaboration Planning and Governance Infrastructure

