Council for Academic Technology and Innovative Education (CATIE)
June 24, 2014
3:00 – 5:00
A&M System (Moore/Connally) Bldg #124
Meeting Summary

Attendees:

TAMU-Central Texas:	Lisa Bunkowski, Troy Courville
TAMU-Commerce:	Julie McElhany, Mike Smith
TAMU-Corpus Christi:	Lauren Cifuentes, Paul Meyer
TAMU:	Jim Snell, Jenna Kurten (substitute for Kim Dooley)
TAMU-Galveston:	Bill Elizondo (substitute for Joan Mileski)
HSC:	Paul Brandt
TAMU-Kingsville:	Michelle Duran, Lori Kupczynski
TAMIU:	Pat Abrego
TAMU-SA:	Sherita Love
TAMU-T:	Steven Shidemantle
PVAMU:	Charlene Stubblefield, John Williams
TSU:	Anthony Edwards, Kelley Shaffer
WTAMU:	James Andrews, Lora Haasl
TEES:	Yakut Gazi
TEEX:	Lesa Hill
TTI:	Terri Parker
AgriLife Extension:	Holly Jarvis Whitaker
TAMUS:	James Hallmark, Sheri Pappas, Mark Stone

Welcome and introductions by Dr. Hallmark:
Greetings to the A&M System Council for Academic Technology and Innovative Education (CATIE). Attendees asked to introduce themselves. Dr. Hallmark noted that the strength of this committee is through the varied backgrounds of the participants and their reporting avenues.

Briefing regarding the restructure from DEAC to CATIE:
Dr. Hallmark briefed the committee on the need to move from DEAC to CATIE. The newly formed CATIE will allow the membership to prioritize and focus on the academic issues associated with IT, technology, classroom instruction, distance education and other matters affecting system members as appropriate.

> **Dr. Hallmark restated the purpose of CATIE**: The purpose of The Texas A&M University System CATIE is to support the educational mission of the system members in matters related to technology use in the design, development, delivery, and assessment of courses and programs. The CATIE members provide collaborative strategic direction, guidance, and recommendations on technology-enriched teaching, learning, and assessment initiatives that present a continuum. This continuum starts in the classroom with learning space design and classroom technologies and expands to inverted, blended, online, videoconference, tele-conference, MOOC environments and emerging trends. CATIE works in close collaboration with other System-level councils and committees.

Overview of CATIE Structure:
CATIE is composed of two members from each of the academic institutions, one member from each agency, branch campus and HSC. Ex-officios are VCAA, CIO and Academic Affairs coordinator. CATIE Executive Council (EC) is the governing body providing leadership, determining priorities, creating sub-committees and ad-hoc task forces as needed. CATIE EC is composed of eight elected members from the committee at large. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the EC will be appointed from within by the VCAA.

CATIE membership will meet no less than twice per year via face-to-face, audio/web conference or any combination. CATIE EC will meet no less than once per long semester and in the summer (may be in conjunction with an event such as the Chancellor's Summit on Academic Technology) via face-to-face, audio/web conference or any combination and more often if needed.

Elections for CATIE Executive Council:
Nominations solicited from the group - 14 members nominated, one declined. Eight member EC is formed.

The CATIE EC members are:
- Pat Abrego – TAMIU
- James Andrews - WTAMU
- Paul Brandt – HSC
- Kim Dooley – TAMU
- Michelle Duran – TAMU-K
- Yakut Gazi – TEES
- Julie McElhany – TAMU-C
- Charlene Stubblefield – PVAMU
  - James Hallmark – ex officio TAMUS
  - Sheri Pappas – ex officio TAMUS

Summary of Comments from Mr. Mark Stone, Chief Information Officer, A&M System:
Mr. Stone provided a review of the A&M System IT structure and how CATIE fits into this structure. Governance fails when decision makers don't have authority. And decision makers with authority don't have information. Most of us who have been asked to make decisions lack the authority to do so. Those often times having the authority don't have the information needed to make the decision. That is why the governance structure must address this information gap. The governance structure must address who makes decisions, what decisions do they have to make, how will these decisions be made and how will these decisions be monitored? In that IT investments are central to both academic and research learners, in that organizational strategies always drive IT strategies, in that IT standards, policies and procedures need to be both participatory and member wide, it is necessary for us to develop a proposed governance structure that is simple, has the right people involved, empowers the parties to act, is widely understood, drives the desired behaviors, and ensures accountability.

The proposed structure creates new committees - specifically the TAMUS IT Executive Committee and the IT Academic Committee. The proposed structure incorporates established committees – the CIO Council and this committee, CATIE. The proposed structure articulates spheres of responsibility – academic technology, research technology, security, infrastructure, applications, etc. Establishing policies and procedures will be the easy part. Changing behavior will be the difficult part. TAMUS Executive IT committee will have the following responsibilities: they will approve the enterprise IT vision, the overall IT budget, and set priorities. The IT Academic Operation Committee will define and recommend approaches to academic and research matters that involve anything with IT. They will ask the various committees reporting into them to take the lead in exploring

new opportunities and evaluate the best options to pursue. The CATIE Executive Committee will provide leadership in matters related to the use of technology in the design, delivery and assessment of all academic courses and programs. The Research Enablement Committee will focus on the coordination and communication to support the research technologies across the system. It is possible that the Research Enablement Committee be replaced by the committee that will ultimately run the institute and be named the Center for Computational Sciences (i.e., partnership with IBM). This new governance structure will be successful because the real decision makers will be identified, given the necessary authority, provided with the required information and partnered with the appropriate IT resources to support the priority that academic and research leaders have for the System and its members.

Additional slides available in handout provides details on other committees.

Questions directed to Mr. Stone:
>**Charlene Stubblefield**: Will the new structure help alleviate the "musical chair syndrome" of people moving in and out of positions?
>**Response by Mr. Stone:** It is a helpful starting point but may not solve the problem. Hopefully over time there will be less of the musical chair syndrome.
>
>**Yakut Gazi**: There is a computer program called MathLab. The people in College Station (Engineering) want to create some common licenses. With this governance structure, what is the path for this group to explore their options for common licenses?
>**Response by Mr. Stone:** At the institution level, the engineering group should have a relationship with the technology side of the organization that would come up through the CIO Council or through the members of CATIE from the academic side. This allows me (Stone) to become involved as needed.
>
>**Follow up question by Yakut Gazi**: it is my understanding that the former DEAC council was just an advisory council however, the formation of this council (CATIE) now has authority to make decisions?
>**Response by Mr. Stone:** yes, but we need to recognize the balance between advising versus becoming prescriptive.

Tony Edwards: will this council have conversations regarding the use of technology in courses?
Response by Dr. Hallmark: it is not the place of the council to interject themselves on how courses are developed within individual campuses but rather the council will focus on issues of collaboration and best practices.

Timeline for Governance Structure: Mr. Stone stated that at the macro level the timeline is for all other councils to be on board (and operating) by September. There is another governance structure to be established at the member level sometime in the spring. That governance structure will be more of a template that everyone will start with and then modify-that will become the feeder mechanism for the macro level councils. The idea is to establish a framework for all institutions to follow that continues the conversations within the institutions to the system.

Question by Paul Meyer: I am assuming that the topics that the council and other committees would consider would be initially from the top down but later more from the bottom up?
Response from Mr. Stone: I hope over time that more are from bottom up rather than top down. Example of a bottom up issues would be standardizing on a common LMS. If this came to me as a bottom up issue then we would explore it but right now it is not on the radar as a top down issue.

Collaborative Pricing Recap by Mr. Stone - specifically Web Conferencing. Two choices surfaced to the top for the educational tools that was Bb Collaborate and Adobe (both are tightly integrated with LMS). A third tool for the administrative side of the house and that is WebEx. I am now in heavy negotiations with all three. My goal is to leverage volume discounts for the system members but not force one or two products at this time. This committee will be involved at some level as we move through the negotiation process.

Timeline for collaborative pricing: actual timeline is not set. The hope is sooner rather than later - now working on tiered pricing from vendors. As soon as pricing is acceptable then system will enter into contract.

Comments by Dr. Hallmark: although standardizing on one or two products is advantageous from the stand point of collaborative pricing, we cannot overlook innovation. System members need to have the flexibility and opportunity to explore and try new products. Standardization and innovation is a fine line to walk, we must proceed cautiously.

Brief discussion regarding Adobe Enterprise License Agreement (ELA): Adobe is offering access to their full suite of products. For 10,000 students you would pay $31/student/ year. CIOs felt that certain schools inside their respective university use the full suite while others only use basically one or two items within the suite. The CIOs felt it would be less expensive to continue with the current model rather than going to the ELA. Overall, CATIE agreed with CIOs.

Dr. Hallmark presented topics of discussion and potential CATIE priorities to the committee:
- System Policy 17.02.02
- Integrity
- Collaboration
- Inter-institutional Agreement
- Professional Development
- Best Practices

Dr. Hallmark opened the floor for discussion:
Bill Elizondo – issues of concern on behalf of Joan Mileski
- Identity Management
- Consistency of delivery
- Overall A&M Experience

Pat Abrego
- What keeps you up at night? Quality in the classroom -- education
- Looking for the A&M System to provide some standards regarding quality and other issues
- Not just a matter of the quality in the course but also the experience for the student

Julie McElhany and Lisa Bunkowski
- Accessibility issues

Lori Kupczynski
- Expressed concern regarding top down push of templating (i.e., prescribing) to the universities regarding consistency and delivery.
Clarification by Dr. Hallmark regarding consistency and delivery. When I heard that I was not thinking of templates across the system but templates within the institutions such that a student taking an online master's

course in one discipline is not getting an entirely different look than a student taking an online course in a different discipline. An example of what CATIE as a committee may send forward as a requirement is "every institution must have a rigorous quality assessment process in place" - still allowing the university to interpret "rigorous quality assessment process." In essence, CATIE should provide guidance as to where we want to go while allowing the institutions to decide how they plan to get there.

General Discussion:
- State Authorization – would like a more coordinate effort
- Share innovative practices
- Poster sessions
- Design of course and technology available
- Form of consistency
- Faculty ability to teach in online environment
- Student evaluations
- Should not use the classroom lens to define the parameters of online learning
- Multiple course delivery
  - Single course delivered by instructor
  - Master course delivered by multiple instructors
- Faculty comfort zone
- Marketplace-student expectations, student enrollments
- Student services
  - Study abroad
  - High impact educational practices
  - Other things outside the class
- Movement to hybrid and blended courses
- Student demographics
- Instructional technology
  - Bleeding edge-try new and innovative approaches

Action Items:
- Chair, Vice-chair and EC to set-up operational structure for working groups
- Committee members to send in top five priorities to chair/vice-chair