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February 5, 2003
Meeting Summary

Minutes (available on web and already distributed by listserv)

Attendees: Chair Chris Foote, Vice Chair Alfonso Cardenas, Christine Borgman, Janet Chiang, Brian Copenhaver, Jim Davis, Janice Koyama, Sam Morabito, Tom Phelan

ITTF Attendees: Professor Jackson Beatty (Chair, FCET), Professor Katherine Hayles, Dean Robert Lapiner, Associate Vice Provost Larry Loeher, Associate Dean Adeline Nyamathi

Guests: Ruth Sabean, Assistant Provost/OIT; John Sandbrook, Assistant Provost; Avishai Shraga, Bruinwalk.com; Judi Smith, Vice Provost; Marsha Smith, ATS; Nick Todd, Professional Development Program participant; Esther Woo-Benjamin, OIT

1. Reports

Chris Foote reported on an Open Courseware Videoconference between MIT and all UC campuses. MIT’s goal is to make materials widely available. They currently have 50 courses on line, will have 500 by September 2003, and plan to add 500 each year. Much of the work is outsourced, but the operation is very labor intensive, requiring 14 FTE at MIT and an additional 20-25 FTE from outsource.

2. Bruinwalk.com

John Sandbrook reviewed the history of Bruinwalk and issues related to Professor Profiles. Bruinwalk is a funded and authorized Student Media initiative. Professor Profiles is the first web based initiative of student publications and is an attempt to fill the gap in distributing information to students. Current issues include:

- Public access to Professor Profiles
  Faculty objected to Google searches of their names from anywhere in the world resulting in the Bruinwalk.com Professor Profile page often being the first item listed in the results. Web searches, including Google, have now been blocked, but it may take some time for the caches to empty.

There has been a question of who should have access to evaluations and whether access should be limited to members of the University community. Posting is now limited to those with BOL IDs. Numerical evaluations are limited to one, but posting of comments can be done multiple times. At other UC Campuses, the Administration collects and coordinates the data. At the
University of Austin, Texas, for example, evaluations are available, but password protected.

- **Lack of verification as to basis for student comments**
  Faculty are concerned that while a BOL logon is required for access, there is no verification that the individual posting the comment was enrolled in the class. Such verification would require access to the Student Records Database (SRDB) of the Office of the Registrar (as an electronic query, which would not violate confidentiality). Jim Davis agreed to investigate costs and feasibility of implementing this check.

Avishai Shraga, Director of Bruinwalk reported that the use of the site is widespread. During the last enrollment period, there were 30,000 unique hits. There is strong desire to cooperate with faculty to address their concerns. Examples of changes influenced by faculty concern are: blocking Google searches, filtering evaluations for language and appropriateness of content, and removing or replacing faculty photographs on request.

Larry Loeher gave a quick summary of the history of OID Teaching Evaluations. These ‘official’ evaluations were introduced in 1970 for ‘improvement of instruction’. The data collected was returned to departments and used for reviewing teaching effectiveness. Subsequently they have been used as part of the academic personnel process. The response rate to these evaluations is 89%. The role of the OID evaluations was discussed, with suggestions that they be posted on the OID website and/or on Bruinwalk.com. Related to those suggestions was a caution that each evaluation has a different purpose: one is for improving courses and the other is for students to decide whether to take a class; and they should not be confused. At issue is the lack of clarity on ownership, use, and release of the OID data. The ITPB suggested that these issues be referred to the Academic Senate and agreed to write a recommendation to the Senate.

3. **Instructional Technology**

   a) Instructional Technology Task Force (ITTF) Report

   Jim Davis reported that the ITTF Final Report is the result of a set of discussions influenced heavily by the directions articulated in the IT Vision plan for Student Integration (faculty-student interaction, student-student interaction, etc.). The discussions have come to partial closure and the ITTF is looking for ITPB support and direction for next steps.

   The ITPB supported all five recommendations contained in the report (see [http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm](http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm)). In the ‘Findings’ section of the report, the suggestion was made to more positively represent the many significant changes which are occurring in classroom instruction, for example, the work done
to totally redesign and delivery of the Life Sciences core curriculum. This section will be redrafted and re-circulated among the ITTF for a few language issues.

b) Faculty Blended Instruction Pilot Report

Ruth Sabean reviewed the Blended Instruction Pilot proposal (see http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm) and emphasized the need to make it a formal pilot so that barriers, policies, and necessary infrastructure can be examined; and to build institutional learning to make a recommendation for moving forward.

The Blended Instruction Pilot concept was strongly supported. Although external funding will continue to be sought, the recommendation was to draft a proposal for presentation to the Executive Vice Chancellor as a mechanism to garner and secure UCLA core funding for this initiative. Jackson Beatty, Ruth Sabean, and Judi Smith will assume responsibility for implementing this recommendation.

c) Faculty Committee on Educational Technology (FCET) Update

The FCET was appointed by the Provost in December 2001 with the charge to do a number of things (see http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm) and they have focused on the goals of improving 1) the instructional technology infrastructure and 2) support services for using technology in teaching. Jackson Beatty summarized four of their projects:

- **Course Management System**
  The purpose is to develop a common approach and system for use across the College, based on national standards, and enabling UCLA to work with other institutions. A variety of systems, both proprietary and open source currently exist. A course management workgroup was formed to develop an open source alternative and a proof of concept is underway.

- **Digital Tools Initiative**
  The vision is providing access to the best digital tools needed to do teaching and research. Early discussions are underway to shape a pilot. An option is to use Application Servers for expensive software. If done properly, this could pay for itself in lowered licensing fees.

- **Provost’s Award for Innovation in Teaching with Technology**
  The purpose is to recognize instructors who are making significant and unique contributions and to provide a social mechanism for rapid infusion of ideas. Nominations for the first award are flooding in.

- **Electronic Portfolios**
The objective is to have a mechanism for assembling a portfolio with examples of work that can be used for a variety of purposes.

There was a suggestion that the FCET be expanded to include representation from the professional schools that provide significant amounts of undergraduate teaching. The ITPB recommended that the FCET remain focused on undergraduate instruction and that expansion be undertaken with care in order to preserve the effectiveness of the committee. Jackson Beatty and Ruth Sabean will assume responsibility for this recommendation. Engineering and Arts are the obvious schools to add a member from.

4. Future Meetings:

- Friday, March 21, 3:00-5:00 @ 2121 Murphy

5. Action Items

- Investigate costs and feasibility of implementing a check for course enrollment before allowing Professor Profiles posting (Jim Davis)
- Draft recommendation to Academic Senate regarding use and release of OID Teaching Evaluations (Chris Foote)
- Rework ‘Findings’ section of ITTF Final Report to more positively represent significant changes in classroom instruction (Jim Davis, Ruth Sabean)
- Draft proposal to EVC for Blended Instruction Pilot funding (Jackson Beatty, Ruth Sabean, Judi Smith)
- Draft letter of support to EVC for Blended Instruction Pilot (Chris Foote and Jim Davis)
- Expand FCET to include representation from professional schools (Jackson Beatty, Ruth Sabean)

6. Adjourn