2017-2018 Annual Report
C-14 Technology Enhanced Education Oversight Committee

Executive Summary

During the 2017-18 academic year, the Technology-Enhanced Education Oversight Committee (C-14 Committee) focused on two initiatives. First, the committee continued to explore the feasibility of Inclusive Access licensing with publishers to reduce the cost of textbook and course materials for students. Second, the committee researched and made recommendations for an Educational Software Review and Request process. The committee approved *ex-officio*, non-voting membership for an IT Research and Educational Technology Committee Representative and a Faculty Innovation Center Representative. The committee identified shared interests between the C-14 Committee, C-13 Committee, and IT Research Educational Technology committees and made recommendations for next year's agenda.

1. Continue to work on getting Inclusive Access pilot off the ground. (We are in constant communication with the Co-op, UT Legal, and the publishers to get this working. Legal feels we need to craft a separate contract between the university and the Co-op related specifically to Inclusive Access. I'm meeting with Steve Rosen, et al in the next few weeks to hopefully get some clear plan of action It's been a two-year process so far.) Inclusive Access is a partnership between UT and textbook publishers (via the COOP) to offer digital access to textbooks at a reduced cost to students. All agree it will be a huge cost savings, but the devil is in the details.

2. We are continuing to work on putting together an infrastructure for education software review committee at the college and university level to a) provide oversight on what educational software is used by faculty currently b) make sure all software is vetted c) provide a means for faculty to request site licenses for specific software. I just met with Dean Smith to talk about what this might look like at the university level. Next is meetings with FIC and the implementation group (central IT and college IT folks) to talk about how to do all this. Meanwhile, we've put together a education software review committee in CNS. This will take some coordination of all the colleges, so there might be some subcommittee work here. We will also coordinate closely with C-13.

3. New business - depending on what committee members bring up!

<div align="right">Jen Moon, Chair</div>

Submitted by: Jen Moon (Chair)

After the organizational meeting in September, the C-14 committee met seven (7) times in the 2017-2018 academic year. All relevant documents, agendas, and meeting summaries were posted to a shared BOX folder for all members. Dr. Rob Crosnoe agreed to serve as Vice Chair. Key membership changes included the mid-term departure of members Phil Long and Tara O'Neill, and the approval of two additional committee members: *IT Research and Educational Technology Committee Representative* (Mario Guerra) and *Faculty Innovation Center Representative* (Josh Walker) as *ex officio*, non-voting members of C-14.

Key Initiatives

1. Recommendations on Inclusive Access Licensing with textbook publishers to reduce student financial burden [Work continued from the 2016-2017 academic year]

Background. In 2016-2017, the committee began to explore ways in which education technology could be used to reduce the financial burden on students. The committee focused on exploring the Inclusive Access (IA) license agreement and to pilot the IA program in the Biology core courses: Introductory Biology I and II, and Genetics. A series of meetings with stakeholders followed (e.g., Faculty teaching the core courses, representatives from McGraw Hill, Pearson, Verba, VitalSource, the UT CO-OP, and Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Darrell Bazzell). The IA pilot program proposal gained conditional support from Harrison Keller, C-14 committee member and Deputy to the President for Strategy and Policy. The condition was that UT Legal must approve the IA program. *For additional context and details, please refer to C-14's 2016-2017 Annual Report.*

In the 2016-2017 Annual Report, C-14 committee recommended that, if UT wishes to pursue Inclusive Access, a point person should be identified that can strategically mediate and represent UT's interest in its relationships with publishers and other vendors.

In November of the 2017-2018 academic year, the Provost's Office appointed Lorraine Haricombe, Vice Provost and Director of UT Libraries and C-14 member, to mediate the Inclusive Access stakeholder's interests, and serve as an interface between the third-party stakeholders (e.g. UT CO-OP, publishers, etc) and the students, staff, and faculty at UT-Austin.

Early in the fall semester, it was determined that UT Legal needed time to consider the fee structure and other logistical issues related to Inclusive Access. That process is still underway as of the writing of this report, May 2018. During 2017-2018 academic year, the C-14 chair continued to meet with stakeholders, such as Biology faculty, publisher representatives from

Pearson, McGraw Hill, and Wiley, and representatives from VitalSource/Verba (Hadra Brown), the CO-OP board (Hillary Hart), and UT Legal (Patti Ohlendorf).

There is considerable evidence the IA model is beneficial to students. In September, the chair of C-14 attended the "Achieving 60X30TX with Inclusive Access Forum" hosted by the American Association of Publishers, during which CIO Brad Wheeler summarized Indiana University- Bloomington's work with IA that saved students $8.1 million in textbook costs in the 2016-2017 academic year alone[1]. Other major universities are adopting IA as well. For example, the OHIOLink Inclusive Access option (facilitated by Ohio University System Libraries) is a state-wide IA program available for all Ohio System schools of higher education[2]. The University of Utah's Inclusive Access (facilitated by the bookstore) has a concise overview of the program and FAQ available for students[3]. Notable Texas universities and colleges that have entered IA licensing agreements are UT's McCombs Executive MBA program at UT-Austin (Lynn Slattery, Director, McCombs School of Business), UT-Arlington (Math Department), Texas State University (Biology) and Austin Community College.

Next Steps. Once UT Legal has approved the Inclusive Access pilot, further challenges include shaping the workflow of the Inclusive Access model and facilitating the interaction between UT's Student Information System and the CO-OP/Vital Source/publishing companies for billing and student communication about IA. The C-14 committee believes these hurtles are surmountable. In the 2018-2019 academic year, the C-14 Committee will continue to explore the Inclusive Access model with a possible pilot study in the Introductory Biology and Genetics courses in Spring 2019.

Recommendations (continued from the 2016-2017 academic year).
1. The C-14 Committee recommends that UT-Austin continues to pursue exploration of the Inclusive Access model to reduce student financial burden.
2. The committee recommends the implementation of an Inclusive Access pilot study in high enrollment courses, such as Introductory Biology and Genetics, or similar, to determine the feasibility and scalability of the project.

2. Exploration and recommendations for Educational Software Review and Request process (Subcommittee)

Background. The C-14 committee identified the need for colleges to review current educational software licenses and educational software use among faculty. In addition, there was a need to create transparency in how faculty may request financial support for the use educational software, such as the purchase of a site license. Educational software may be student-focused, such as a homework service or in class response system (e.g. iClicker, TopHat). In this case, the price of using the software may be passed to the student as part of the course materials fee[4]. Other types of educational software are instructor-focused, and serve to assist the instructor with a teaching task (e.g. grading, student team building). Typically, instructor- focused software is available for a free trial, but may ultimately require a site license, paid for by the department, college, or university, to allow continued use (e.g. Gradescope, CatMe). Faculty often learn of educational software options from colleagues, and may not be aware of the legal requirements for using educational software (e.g. FERPA, ISO compliance) or whether the software can integrate with Canvas. If the software requires a site license, faculty may not know whom to contact or how such funding may be obtained.

Indeed, there is currently no formal process at the University to administer educational software purchasing, compliance, coordination, and management.

A C-14 subcommittee formed to address these and related issues surrounding the use of educational software. Subcommittee members were Rob Crosnoe, Mario Guerra, Christine Julien, Phil Long, and Jen Moon.

Members of the subcommittee met with select college and departmental representatives to discuss how the college or department currently receives requests for educational software and the potential for establishing a budget for site license requests. In the College of Natural Sciences, meetings were held with TIDES Director Sarah Eichhorn, Interim Dean David VandenBout, CNS IT Director Mark McFarland, and Information Technology Manager Melissa Medina-Razaaque. Lucas Horton, Director of Instructional Innovation in the College of Education, and Achmed Tewfik, Chair of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering were also consulted.

In spring 2018, Jen Moon submitted an Educational Software Review and Request proposal to the leadership in the College of Natural Sciences, a copy of which may be found in *Appendix A*.

Committee members also discussed the role of Faculty Innovation Center and Project 2021 in educational software use at UT and the lack of an 'academic facing' component of Information Technology. The committee suggested a model in which all colleges could contribute to a central fund (perhaps managed in FIC) for site licenses. The committee also discussed the option of asking the R&E committee to handle requests for licensing.

Because of the broadening use of the grading assistance program Gradescope, the subcommittee decided to use Gradescope as a test case for creating a process for site license acquisition. Regular communication with the Gradescope representatives Jerry Kennedy, (Institutional Partnerships) and Gal Friedman (Growth) occurred throughout the year, resulting in a faculty demo and phone conversations with ECE Chair Achmed Tewfik, TIDES Director Sarah Eichhorn, and committee members Christine Julien, Jen Moon and Mario Guerra to identify Gradescope usage on campus and license contract fees. Currently, CNS and ECE are in the process of identifying possible Gradescope competitors for assessment, with the option to pilot Gradescope or a competitor software program for all CNS and ECE faculty in the Fall 2018. The work is on-going and will continue into the next academic year.

Nest Steps. Creating a campus-wide Education Software Review and Request process is a significant undertaking. Any policies related to this process requires the collaboration of the CIO, Legal Affairs, Procurement Office, Information Technology (centralized or college-based), budget and faculty curriculum committees, and teaching faculty. Moreover, UT is currently in the process of hiring a new CIO and it will be prudent to consult with the new CIO before moving forward.

To increase efficiency in the procurement of site licenses, to increase awareness amongst faculty about the types of educational software available and required compliance components, and to eliminate financial redundancies between departments and colleges, we make the following recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Because of the complexity of the process, we propose that the CIO/Provost's Office create an Education Software Task Force to a) create an inventory of educational software in use by college, and any associated license agreements, and b) create a list of recommendations for campus-wide coordination

2. Establish college-specific *Educational Software Review* committees or point persons.

3. The *Educational Software Review Committee/Point person* would
   a. review proposals for site license purchases
   b. coordinate with similar committees/persons at other colleges and/or with a university level point person (such as Mario Guerra, Senior IT Manager)
   c. maintain a current list of educational software in use
   d. advise and make recommendations to administration and faculty, as needed

4. Allocate an 'Educational Software' budget to fund site licenses and/or other costs associated with educational software

3. A Revised Mission Statement for C-14

Background. In response to a request from Faculty Council administration, the committee revisited the mission statement of C-14 to discuss possible changes. Although no changes were proposed in the allotted time frame to make the change, subsequent discussion included the possible collaboration with C-13 on defining scope of the C-14 and C-13 missions, including:

    a. programmatic proposals
    b. technology-enhanced courses and curricula offered by the University and certificates and degrees associated with such
    c. academic quality of other on-line resources
    d. use of on-line materials for credit toward University degrees (including transfer credits and dual credits)
    e. overall impact of such offerings on workload, intellectual property, and promotion/tenure issues for faculty and instructional staff
    f. student issues, such as privacy

Next steps. In the 2018-2019 academic year, C-14 will continue to explore collaboration with C-13, and re-define the C-14 mission, as necessary.

References and Footnotes:

[1] Lieberman, Mark (2018) *How a Digital Textbook Initiative Achieved Liftoff.* Inside Higher Education. https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2018/05/02/indiana- university-inclusive-access-model-offers-road-map-others

[2] OhioLINK state-wide inclusive access program: https://www.ohiolink.edu

[3] University of Utah's inclusive access program, with FAQs and program description: http://www.campusstore.utah.edu/inclusiveaccess/

[4] *Digital polling technologies are included in the category of "other course materials" over which faculty have discretion in Regents' Rule 31004: Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members, Section 6.1. Any polling technology must be vetted for FERPA, ADA and ISO security clearance.*

Prepared and submitted by Jen Moon, Chair C-14 and Senior Lecturer in CNS

Overview

Faculty may use any number of educational software products in the classroom. Such software may be student-focused, such as a homework service or in class response system (e.g. TopHat). If applicable, the price of using the software may be passed to the student as part of the course materials fee*. Other types of educational software are instructor-focused, and serve to assist the instructor with a teaching task (e.g. grading, student team building). Typically, instructor- focused software is available for a free trial, but may ultimately require a site license to allow continued use (e.g. Gradescope).

Statement of the problem

Faculty often learn of educational software options from colleagues, and may not be aware of the legal requirements for using educational software (e.g. FERPA, ISO compliance) or whether the software can integrate with Canvas. If the software requires a site license, faculty may not know whom to contact or how such funding may be obtained.

Indeed, there is currently no formal process in CNS (or at the University) to administer educational software purchasing, compliance, coordination, and management.

Recommendations

To begin to address these and other related issues surrounding the use of educational software, we make the following recommendations:

5. Establish *CNS Educational Software Review Committee*. Committee may include:
   a. Director of TIDES (Sarah Eichhorn) (*suggested chair of the committee)
   b. CNS IT Director (Mark McFarland)
   c. Information Technology Manager (Melissa Medina-Razaaque)
   d. One to two faculty members to serve as faculty representatives

6. The *CNS Educational Software Review Committee* would
   a. review proposals for site license purchases
   b. coordinate with similar committees/persons at other colleges and/or with Mario Guerra, Senior IT Manager (Project 2021/Educational Innovation)
   c. maintain a current list of educational software in use in CNS
   d. advise and make recommendations to administration and faculty, as needed

7. Allocate an 'Educational Software' budget of $45,000 to fund site licenses and/or other costs associated with educational software use in CNS.

It is our goal that these recommendations will increase efficiency in the procurement of site licenses for CNS, increase awareness amongst faculty about the types of educational software available and required compliance components, and eliminate financial redundancies between departments and colleges.

Digital polling technologies are included in the category of "other course materials" over which faculty have discretion in Regents' Rule 31004: Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members, Section 6.1. Any polling technology must be vetted for FERPA, ADA and ISO security clearance.

Projected Outcomes

If an 'educational software' review and acquisition process is implemented in CNS, we anticipate the following outcomes

  a. an index of educational software currently used by CNS faculty
  b. oversight on the security compliance (FERPA, ISO, etc) of educational software used by faculty
  c. heighted awareness among faculty of the software options available for various teaching tasks
  d. a process by which faculty may request a site license purchase for educational software
  e. coordinate at the university (or other colleges and schools) level to avoid redundancy in licensing and to allow for volume pricing, as appropriate
  f. a systematic (perhaps annual) review by the *Educational Software Review Committee* for all licenses purchased by the college to ensure software continues to be used by faculty

Proposal's Connection to University Initiatives

This proposal to create Educational Software Review Committee in CNS originates from discussions in the faculty council standing committee, C-14: Technology Enhanced Education Software Committee. Members of C-14 are tasked with reaching out to their college leadership to inquire about the process of adopting new educational software. We envision the work in CNS to provide a model for setting policy for how educational software is adopted throughout the university.

Jen Moon, Chair, Technology Enhanced Education Software Committee (C-14)

Supplemental documents include:

  A. A list of current educational software used in CNS
  B. Sample Faculty Survey Form: Educational Software Use Survey
  C. Sample Proposal Form: Request for Educational Software Support

A. Educational Software use in CNS

TopHat	TopHat	No	$26/semester (lower price for longer terms)	no	Yes	classroom response system
SquareCap	SquareCa	no	$10/semester (lower price for longer terms)	no	Yes	classroom response system
iClicker/REEF	iClicker	no	$14.99/semester (lower price for longer terms)	no	Yes	classroom response system
Gradescop	Gradescop	$1-$4 per stud. neg.	n/a	no	yes	grading system
CATME	CATME	$1300/year (Mario)	n/a	no	yes	team creation software
ChemDraw	PerkinElme	yes	n/a	yes, Chemistry	no	Chemical drawing software

B. Sample Survey Form: Educational Software Use Survey

This survey could be distributed via Qualtrics from CNS Student Dean's Office or by associate chairs/directors to faculty, timing coordinated with registration. Form will need to be filled out on a PERCOURSE basis. Alternatively, we could coordinate with the UT Co-op to have the survey delivered as part of the textbook adoption process.

1. Name: _____

2. Course: _____

3. Projected Enrollment: _____

4. Classroom location: _____

5. For the course indicated, are you planning on using educational software (including classroom response systems (e.g. iClicker), or homework management systems (e.g. Gradescope)? [Do NOT include software that is part of a publisher homework service (e.g. LearnSmart, Mastering).]

         Yes   No   I don't know

Skip Logic: if NO >>>> Thank you for completing this survey.

Skip Logic: If *I don't know* >>>>>> "For the coordination of digital educational resources across the college, it is helpful for TIDES and IT to be aware of the types of software faculty are using. Please contact XXXX to inform them about your decision regarding use of educational software as soon as possible. Thanks!"

Skip Logic: if YES:

6. For the course indicated, which of the following educational software services are you using or assigning to students? (Check all that apply.)

   o iClicker (device only)
   o iClicker REEF (cloud based service)
   o SquareCap
   o TopHat
   o Piazza
   o Gradescope
   o ChemDraw
   o (etc.….)
   o I would like to use software that is NOT on this list

   Skip Logic: if select any of the specific options >>> "THANK YOU for filling out this survey. You're all set! Have a great semester."

   Skip Logic: if select "software NOT on this list" GO TO:
7. *Do you currently have TIDES Review Board approval for use of this software? (Faculty have the right to choose the educational software they would like to use, provided it is FERPA and ISO compliant. The approval process allows IT and administrative to have oversight and to coordinate use of educational software across the College. Approval may take 2 weeks to 6 months depending on the type of software requested.)*
                    Yes   No   Don't know

   SKIP LOGIC: if select "NO" or Don't Know >>>> User is directed to "Educational Software Proposal" form and directions on where to send it, etc.>>>>

   SKIP LOGIC: if select "YES"
   >>>>> Thank you for helping us. You're all set! Have a great semester.>>>>>>>>>>>>>

C. Sample Proposal Form: Request for Educational Software Support

Name of Requestor: _____ **UT EID**: _____

Department: _____

Name of Software: _____

Vendor: _____

Vendor contact information (for institutional licensing):

Name: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Number of courses currently using software: _____
Mario Guerra can provide this information if software is integrated with Canvas
Contact Vendor or CNS IT for this information if software is not currently integrated with Canvas

Do you know whether the software is:

ISO Compliant?	Yes	No	Don't know
FERPA Compliant?	Yes	No	Don't know
Does the software require classroom Wifi?	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you know of any other colleges/schools at UT that use or wish to use this software?	Yes	No	Don't know

If yes, list the college/school: _____

Justification for adoption:
(Briefly describe the educational benefits for students and/or faculty. Include in your justification a short statement describing why the licensed software currently available through CNS is insufficient for the course.)

_____

_____

_____

Approval:

- o   TIDES Education Software Review Board

    Signature:_____Date: _____

- o   Information Technology Representative

    Signature:_____Date: _____

- o   Dean's Office

    Signature:_____Date: _____