Technology is a Metaphor for Change

Technology is also a metaphor for risk.

Technology is a means of uncertainty reduction that is made possible by the cause-effect relationships upon which the technology is based. A technological innovation creates a kind of uncertainty (about its expected consequences) in the minds of potential adopters, as well as representing an opportunity for reduced uncertainty in another sense (reduced by the information base of the technology). Thus, the innovation-decision process is essentially an information-seeking and information-processing activity in which the individual is motivated to reduce uncertainty about the advantages and disadvantages of the innovation.
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The Context of the Campus IT Conversation

WHAT DO WE KNOW?
- The consumer experience now defines (rising) expectations about campus IT resources & services.
- There is rising pressure for higher education to provide the much promised productivity bang for all the IT bucks.

TWO KEY ISSUES
- Why don’t faculty do more with IT and eLearning?
- Why don’t colleges and universities make better use of IT for campus management?

Great Aspirations

Both the processing and the uses of information are undergoing an unprecedented technological revolution. Not only are machines now able to deal with many kinds of information at high speed and in large quantities, but it is also possible to manipulate these quantities so as to benefit from them in new ways. This is perhaps nowhere truer than in the field of education. One can predict that in a few years, millions of schoolchildren will have access to what Philip of Macedon’s son Alexander enjoyed as a royal prerogative: the services of a tutor as well-informed and as responsive as Aristotle.

Patrick Suppes
Scientific American
October, 1966
déjà vu

For better or worse, television dominates much of American life and manners….Part of [the] lackluster record of the educational uses of television is of course due to the heretofore merciless economies of the medium. But profound pedagogic mistrust of the medium also remains a fact of life. The proof of the pudding lies in the fact that on many campuses, fancy television equipment…now lies idle and often unused…. Academic indifference to this enormously powerful medium becomes doubly incomprehensible when one remembers that the present college generation is also the first television generation.

George Bonham
Television: The Unfulfilled Promise
Change, 1972

Attention Must Be Paid
Five Key Technology Issues

- *plus ça change*: how do we get faculty to . . .
- “MOOC Madness” and Online Education
- OER and Digital Curricular Resources
- Big Data
- The Potemkin Campus
plus ça change
How Do We Get Faculty to…

• 1986: Use computers
• 1996: Use the Internet
• 2012: Use Digital Resources

Changing (evolving!) questions but common underlying issues:
• Training
• User support
• Infrastructure
• Recognition & Reward
• Evidence of Benefit

Underlying Faculty Question
WHY SHOULD I DO THIS?

C/IOS: Top Institutional IT Priorities Over the Next Two-Three Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage who report “very important” (6/7)</th>
<th>All C/IOS</th>
<th>Comm College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting faculty integrate IT into instruction</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing adequate user support</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring/retaining qualified IT staff</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing online education</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing / supporting mobile computing</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading / enhancing network &amp; data security</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing the replacement of aging IT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading / replacing the campus network</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrating to Cloud computing</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading / replacing Admin IT / ERP systems</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading / replacing emergency comm.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top priorities focus on instructional integration and user support.
Presidents, Provosts & CIOs
Rating the Effectiveness of Campus IT Investments, 2012

- Although IT is essential for key activities and operations, many sr. officials do not view technology investments as “very effective.”
- Presidents and provosts are generally less sanguine about the effectiveness of IT investments than their IT officers.

Sources:
Green, Presidential Perspectives Survey, INSIDE HIGHER ED, March 2012
Green, CAO Survey, INSIDE HIGHER ED, Jan 2012
Green, Campus Computing 2012, Nov, 2012

Visualization

Underlying Issues
Can I do this? Why should I do this? Evidence of benefit?
MOOCs

What Do We Know?

The conversation about MOOCs is really a discussion about online education.

MOOC Madness?

- Big numbers, big media coverage, big expectations
- Big dollars?
- Growing trustee and state interest in MOOCs as a way to grow revenue and/or reduce costs
MOOC Madness?

- Flash point on the current landscape of online education
- **MODELS & METAPHORS:** PBS? Oprah’s Book Club?
- Current catalog focuses on upper-division and graduate level courses
- Catalyst for a new conversation about teaching faculty about teaching
- Significant investment in research about learning
- Emerging MOOC “clones”

What Do We Know About MOOCs?

**Big numbers dominate much of the discussion, but:**

- Open enrollment: no pre-reqs, no commitment & no “skin in the game”
- No course fees (no revenue!)
- Big enrollment drops in the first weeks: content, schedule, preparation, student support
- **Ad hoc** student support infrastructure
- Cost accounting for course development and instructional support?

7.5 pct.

Mean completion rate, as reported by 103 MOOC instructors

March 2013 Chronicle of Higher Education Survey of 103 MOOC Instructors
Credit is the Coin of the Realm

- For most institutions, “MOOCing” is a moot issue
- The real issue is academic credit
- Infrastructure is essential to deliver on the promise of access
- Current institutional precedents
- Authentication and certification issues
- Catalyst for conversation about online ed
- Catalyst for a discussion about mission

The First MOOC?

- SUNRISE SEMESTER, a joint venture of NYU and CBS, launched in 1957.
- Lectures at 6:00 am
- 177 for-credit students, plus 120,000 non-credit students
- Cost to the for-credit students: $75
- Broadcast for 25 years, until 1982
“Does your institution have a formal policy regarding the ownership of Web-based curriculum resources and intellectual property resources developed by faculty?”

- 61 pct. of campuses have policies regarding web-based curriculum and IP resources, up 56 pct. in 2006.

Key Questions About Curricular IP Issues

- Who owns it?
- Who catalogs it?
- Who uses it?
- Who controls access?
- Who benefits from it?

“Is Lecture Capture the New Lecture?”

15 Sept 2010
Open Educational Resources (OER) and Digital Education Curricula

“Everyone” hates the textbook -- yet it survives

• The rising pressures on costs
• The emergence of Open Educational Resources
• The arrival of digital texts
• The evolution of adaptive learning technology
• The future of learning analytics

Casting a Shadow

The Kibby Challenge

The publishing industry needs to do all it can to ensure that within 36 months, higher education in the US will be completely digital…. I’m talking about the total transition from a reliance on print textbooks to a full embrace of digital content and learning systems.

Inside Higher Ed, August 2012

Brian Kibby
President
McGraw-Hill Education
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What’s the Price of My Econ Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prices as of 20 Dec 2012</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRINT/NEW: Suggested New (retail/print)</td>
<td>$ 199.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon (paperback)</td>
<td>79.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chegg</td>
<td>112.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half.com</td>
<td>104.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENTAL: Chegg and Textbooks.com</td>
<td>40.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>52.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USED: Amazon (15 Dec; not available on 30 Dec)</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks.com</td>
<td>110.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGITAL: Amazon: Kindle purchase</td>
<td>75.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon: Kindle rental</td>
<td>41.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CourseSmart: rental (6 months)</td>
<td>104.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kno: purchase</td>
<td>103.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kno: rental (6 months)</td>
<td>81.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principles of Microeconomics 5e
Frank and Bernanke

Best Net Use Cost Option < $12.00
Buy New from Amazon and sell back to Amazon for $69.81

Faculty Issues

- Instructional infrastructure
- Cost issues
- Faculty prerogative to select course materials
- Supporting materials for students and faculty
- A compelling, competitive alternative that offers added value at lower cost
Textbooks Are an Ecosystem

And the ecosystem has also become a fortress.
- No (or low) cost to faculty and institutions
- Convenience
- Quality Control
- User Support

The Coming of “Big Data”

Why doesn’t higher ed make effective use of IT for management and operations?
- Opinion and epiphany
- Quest for consensus
- No (or not good/timely) data

“Big Data” tech resources from the consumer and corporate markets are coming to campus: data warehousing, data mining, and business analytics.

We're really just getting underway. But the march of quantification, made possible by enormous new sources of data, will sweep through academia, business, and government. There is no area that is going to be untouched.

Gary King
Director, Harvard’s Institute for Quantitative Social Science
NY Times • 12 Feb 2012
Academe Does Not Make Effective Use of Data for Decisions

My campus does very effective job of “using data to aid and inform campus-decision-making.”

Scale score: 6/7; scale: 1=not effective; 7=very effective

- Although senior campus officials say they want and value data, the majority do not believe that their institutions do a very effective job of using data for decision-making

The Technology Conundrum

We have lots of information technology. We just have too little information.
Which Campus Units Make the Best Use of Data?

- Admissions
- Alumni / Development
- Athletics
- Physical Plant
- Food Service

Why?
- Clear outcomes
- Semi-autonomous
- Independent resources
- Short decision cycles
- Dependent on data

Change the Culture of Data

- OLD: What did YOU do wrong?
- NEW: How do WE do better!

DATA AS A RESOURCE, NOT A WEAPON!

The (Digital) Potemkin Campus

- Rising expectations for the role and availability of IT resources to support instruction and operations/mgmt.
- Infrastructure is critical to the effective use of IT.
- INSTRUCTION: On-campus and online, the instructional infrastructure is not keeping pace with the demand for resources and services.
- OPERATIONS: Higher ed is years behind efforts in the consumer market to leverage the value of data.
The Key Campus Technology Challenges are No Longer about IT

- IT is the “easy part” of technology on campus
- THE CHALLENGES: People, planning, policy, programs, priorities, silos, egos, and IT entitlements
- Providing much-needed support, recognition, and reward for faculty
- Addressing the rising level of digital demand in the midst of reduced financial resources for IT (and other key programs & services)
- Communicating about the effectiveness of and need for IT resources – to on- and off-campus audiences
A Mixed Assessment About the Effectiveness of Campus IT Investments; More Campuses Go Mobile and Slowly to the Cloud, While Fewer Experience IT Budget Cuts

New data from fall 2012 Campus Computing Survey offer a mixed assessment about the effectiveness of institutional investments in information technology. The new survey also confirms big gains in the proportion of institutions that are activating mobile apps and services for their students. Additionally, the 2012 data document the continuing decline in the number of campuses that have experienced IT budget cuts as a consequence of the economic downturn that began in 2008.

Assessing the Effectiveness of Campus IT Investments

A new question on the 2012 Campus Computing Survey reveals that senior campus IT officials offer a very mixed assessment about the effectiveness of various institutional investments in information technology. For example, three-fifths view the institutional investment in IT for library resources and for administrative information systems to be “very effective,” while just over half (55.2 percent) cite the investment in IT for on-campus instruction as “very effective.” In contrast, less than a fourth (22.7 percent) view the IT investment in “data analysis and managerial analytics” as very effective. Among CIOs at research institutions, only a two-fifths (41.7 percent) at public universities and a third (32.6 percent) in private universities assess current IT investments to support research and scholarship as “very effective.”

“These new data suggest that CIOs recognize the need for their institutions to extract more value from the continuing and significant dollars their campuses invest in information technology,” says Kenneth C. Green, founding director of The Campus Computing Survey. “Although colleges and universities are doing many things well with IT, for many campus officials the return on the institutional investment in information technology often falls short of both expectations and need.”

More Colleges Go Mobile

Across all sectors of higher education, the 2012 survey documents another year of big gains in the proportion of colleges and universities that have activated mobile apps. Three-fifths (60.2 percent) of the campuses participating in this year’s survey have activated mobile apps as of fall 2012 or will do so in the coming academic year, compared to two-fifths (41.5 percent) in fall 2011 and 23.1 percent in fall 2010. Across sectors, public universities lead the move to mobile: more than three-fourths (77.8 percent) report active or impending mobile apps for fall 2012, compared to 67.5 percent for private universities, and a range of 50-60 percent for public and private four-year colleges and also for community colleges.

The numbers on the effectiveness of campus IT investments become even more striking when compared to the data from two national surveys of college and university presidents and provosts that Green conducted for Inside Higher Ed in 2011. Taken together, the three surveys reveal that many presidents and provosts are less sanguine about campus IT investments than their IT officers: just 42.1 percent of presidents and 50.0 percent of chief academic officers view the IT investment to support on-campus instruction as “very effective,” compared to 55.2 percent of CIOs. Although 61.5 percent of CIOs report the institutional investment in administrative information systems to be “very effective,” only 39.0 percent of presidents and 33.4 percent of provosts offer a similar assessment. Interestingly, CIOs offer a lower assessment about effectiveness of IT investments to support campus analytical efforts: just 22.7 percent of CIOs view the investment in IT to support data analytics as very effective, compared to 28.6 percent of provosts and 37.7 percent of presidents.

Green says that this gap in the assessments of IT effectiveness among of presidents, provosts, and CIOs could be explained in several ways: “For some campus officials these numbers reflect unfulfilled expectations, while for others it could be that both technology advocates and technology providers have frequently over-promised and under-delivered. And in other instances it may well be that institutional IT officers have failed to communicate the effectiveness of IT investments at their campuses.”

“Several factors explain these continuing gains,” says Green. “Colleges and universities are clearly playing catch-up with the
consumer experience. Students come to campus with their smartphones and tablets expecting to use mobile apps to navigate campus resources and use campus services. Also important is that compared to two years ago, more firms – both LMS and ERP providers – now offer mobile options for their campus clients.”

Green adds that some technology providers now offer free mobile apps, which also means that the costs of going mobile have changed significantly in recent years.

**Fewer Campuses Experience Budget Cuts**

The 2012 data indicate that just over a fourth (27.0 percent) of the surveyed institutions experienced cuts affecting the current (A/Y 2012-13) budget for central IT resources and services, down from more than a third (35.8 percent) in fall 2011, 41.6 percent in 2010, and fully half (50.0 percent) in fall 2009.

Among public institutions, about a third of universities, four-year campuses, and community colleges reported reductions in the central budget for IT fall 2012, down dramatically from 2011, when more than 54.7 percent of public universities, 43.6 percent of public four-year colleges, and 39.0 percent of community colleges experienced central IT budget cuts.

Private/non-profit institutions continue to fare better than their public counterparts: 16.3 percent of private universities experienced central IT budget cuts this year, compared to one-fourth (24.9 percent) in fall 2011 and 56.9 percent in 2009. Among private four-year colleges, the percentage reporting budget cuts fell to 18.3 percent, down from 24.7 percent in fall 2011 and 41.9 percent in 2009.

“The new data offer some generally good news, as fewer institutions experienced IT budget reductions this year than last,” says Green. “But the IT budget cuts continue for many and the proportion of public campuses experiencing IT budget reductions remains high, about a third across all sectors.” Green cites the rising demand for an array of campus IT resources and services – mobile apps, high speed wireless, IT user support services, instructional design assistance for faculty teaching online, and IT security, plus the need to refresh an aging campus IT infrastructure – as major sources of pressure on campus IT budgets, and by extension, major challenges for campus IT leaders.

**Small Gains in Cloud Computing**

Despite the continuing discussion in both the campus and the corporate sectors about the operational and financial benefits of Cloud Computing, the 2012 survey data show only small gains in the movement of mission-critical campus operations to the Cloud. Just 5.9 percent of the survey participants report that their campus has moved or is converting to Cloud Computing for ERP (administrative system) services, up from 4.4 percent in 2011 (range: from 10.2 percent for private universities to 2.1 percent for private four-year colleges). Similarly, just 9.8 percent have moved to Cloud Computing for storage, archiving, or business continuity services as of fall 2012, compared to 6.5 percent last year. And of public universities have migrated these activities to the Cloud as of this fall, compared to 6.6 percent in 2011; among private universities, 7.0 percent report cloud-based HPC activities, compared to 1.1 percent last year.

Other Cloud services post higher numbers. This fall almost two-fifths of the survey participants (38.1 percent, up from 27.8 percent in 2011) report that they have moved or are migrating LMS applications to Cloud services, while a sixth (16.6 percent, up from 10.9 percent last year) indicate that their institution is using a Cloud-based CRM (Customer Relationship Management) application.

“The gains for Cloud Computing posted this year should be encouraging to both campus IT leaders and to technology providers,” says Green, although he notes that the major campus ERP providers only recently began to offer Cloud-based services to their campus clients. Even as the performance benefits and cost savings of migrating to the Cloud appear compelling, “trust really is the coin of the realm: many campus IT officers are not ready to migrate mission-critical data, resources, and services to the Cloud services offered by their IT providers.”

**Continuing Shifts in the LMS Market**

The 2012 data also document an increasing competitive market for Learning Management Systems (LMS). The proportion of survey participants reporting that their institution uses various versions of Blackboard (including Angel and WebCT) as the campus-standard LMS fell to 44.8 percent in fall 2012, down from 50.6 percent in 2011, 57.1 percent 2010, and 71.0 percent in fall 2006. Concurrently, Blackboard’s major LMS competitors – Desire2Learn (11.1 percent in fall 2012), Moodle (20.1 percent), and Sakai (6.1 percent) - have all gained share during this period. Additionally, Canvas by Instructure has emerged as an aggressive new competitor: 4.6 percent of the 2012 survey participants report that their institution has selected Canvas as the campus-standard LMS application, up from zero percent just three years ago.

“The campus LMS market remains a textbook example of a mature market with immature, or evolving, technologies, and that’s a prescription for both volatility and competition,” says Green. “Two-thirds of this year’s survey participants report that their campus is or will soon begin a review of the institutional LMS strategy, affirming the assessment that higher education can be a very volatile market for LMS providers.”

The 2012 Campus Computing Survey is based on survey data provided by senior campus IT officials, typically, the CIO, CTO, or other senior campus IT officer, representing 542 two- and four-year public and private/non-profit colleges and universities across the United States. Survey respondents completed the online questionnaire from September 20 through October 26th. Copies of the 2012 Campus Computing Survey will be available on December 15th from The Campus Computing Project in Encino, CA (campuscomputing.net). Price: $45, which includes shipping to US addresses.
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