

InTRO Report – December 2014

The end of fall term has provided the InTRO team time and space to finalize some early projects and to get prepared for winter term, with a revamped website and new ticketing system. Over the next few months InTRO will continue to inventory UO services and instructional technology needs, and conduct comparator research to set this information in context.

ACTIVITIES

- A ticketing system for InTRO has been designed and deployed, to facilitate requests for assistance and track referral data for future analysis. The InTRO queue can receive requests directly at intro@ithelp.uoregon.edu, as well as through a new service request form on the InTRO website.
- Stakeholder Coordination and Service Provider Inventories: School of Law Instructional Technology; College of Education Informational Technology; AE Distance Education, LMS Migration, and Campus Liaison teams; Faculty Panel/Workshop on Active Teaching and Learning; AIM Faculty; CMET-LMS Manager.
- InTRO currently has four open referral projects. Three are complex, long-term projects in various stages of investigation or referral. The fourth is waiting on a request for information to complete. To date, nine projects have been completed/referred out, one is incomplete, and one is inactive. Referral topics have been wide-ranging, including accessibility access, research technology support, graduate student training, and pedagogical needs.

IN DEVELOPMENT

- The second phase buildout of the InTRO website has begun in cooperation with the AE graphics design team. Site infrastructure will be expanded and page layout improved. Additions and revisions will roll out in stages in early 2015.
- Information and material for an article to publicize InTRO and discuss instructional technology issues have been submitted to Around the O.
- A focus group with ed tech innovators from around campus will be held January 7, 2015. This will be the first of a few informal discussions to gather perspectives from campus faculty and service providers about instructional technology use, present and future.
- A scan of 29 comparator institutions is ongoing, researching processes and organizations related to digital education and instructional technology application. This research will inform InTRO's first annual report, which will be released in June 2015. A list of the selected comparator institutions is provided below.

OBSERVATIONS

- Consultations around campus have demonstrated a significant level of anxiety about the University's migration to Canvas. Questions of process, training, priorities, and schedule are ubiquitous.
- Melissa Woo's CIO presentation to the board of trustees elicited interested responses, particularly in how stresses on UO technology infrastructure impact

Kassia Dellabough, Senior Program Manager
Lindsey Freer, Program Manager
Gregory Milton, Program Manager

InTRO Report – December 2014

- faculty recruiting and retention. Making excellence in educational technology a larger piece of this discussion may be useful.
- There continues to be a disparity between service providers' actual resources and faculty needs, expectations, or interpretations of services needed. The development of shared vocabulary would ease communication among all parties.

NEXT STEPS

- InTRO has been a partner in the early development of a campus-wide educational technology "community of practice," an idea which originated in TEP and A&AA Technology Services. This group will bring together instructional technology practitioners from different units to share ideas and resources. An initial meeting will occur in early 2015. InTRO has offered to liaise between this community of practice and the University's educational technology committee initiatives.

Kassia Dellabough, Senior Program Manager
Lindsey Freer, Program Manager
Gregory Milton, Program Manager

InTRO Report – December 2014

APPENDIX: Comparator Research

Research Questions

1. What services does this institution's Extension unit provide to campus partners?
2. Where is digital education housed? Are there separate units for online learning and blended or hybrid courses? Are technology and pedagogy combined or separate? How much of this effort is centralized?
3. What structures, formal or informal, are in place to encourage pedagogical innovation on campus? Is there any effort to centralize such activity?
4. Where are instructional design and instructional technology housed? What pathways exist to guide faculty to instructional technology services? Is access to instructional technology support uniform across different faculty groups at the institution?
5. At what administrative level are digital education initiatives, endorsed, supported, or made a fundraising priority? For example, does the institution count, encourage, or otherwise track student enrollment or participation in digitally-inflected (hybrid, blended, tech-enhanced F2F) courses? What institutional investments have been made in hybrid and/or blended learning?

Selected Comparator Institutions (29 from official and unofficial lists - AAU, OUS, PAC-12, and IT comparators)

Indiana University
 The University of Iowa
 UNC-Chapel Hill
 UC Santa Barbara
 University of Colorado, Boulder
 University of Michigan
 UVA
 University of Washington
 UCLA
 UC Berkeley
 Arizona State University
 Oregon State University
 Eastern Oregon University
 Portland State University
 Southern Oregon University

Western Oregon University
 Oregon Institute of Technology
 Auburn University
 Colorado State University
 Iowa State University
 UCONN
 UMass-Amherst
 University of Missouri
 University of New Mexico
 University of South Carolina
 University of Tennessee
 University of Utah
 Virginia Commonwealth University
 Washington State University

Kassia Dellabough, Senior Program Manager
 Lindsey Freer, Program Manager
 Gregory Milton, Program Manager