New York University
Faculty Committee on the Future of Technology-Enhanced Education

Follow-up to the Final Report
April 2015

After the ad hoc Faculty Committee on the Future of Technology-Enhanced Education at NYU submitted its final report in July 2014, Provost McLaughlin asked the committee members to continue meeting during the 2014-15 academic year. The goals of reconvening the group were (a) to advise the Provost on the makeup, selection process, and role of the proposed new standing committee, and (b) to provide guidance on the staging and implementation of the other recommendations in our report.

Having met regularly throughout the fall and spring semesters, the committee is pleased to share these additional recommendations, as requested by the Provost:

I. PROPOSED NEW STANDING COMMITTEE: TITLE, CHARGE, AND COMPOSITION

(a) TITLE. The proposed title for the new standing group is the "Committee on Learning Innovation."

(b) CHARGE. The committee's charge would be as follows:

The Committee on Learning Innovation facilitates the process of developing a vision for the future of teaching and learning at the University, especially as it relates to the use of technology innovations.
To that end, the committee:

- promotes experimentation in the schools with technology-enhanced approaches to teaching and research, consulting broadly with faculty, students, and staff;

- identifies and promotes existing projects and future opportunities to explore and assess the pedagogical benefits associated with the use of technology to support teaching and learning objectives;

- identifies and promotes best practices for course design and instruction using technology, and for institutional support of technology-enhanced education;

- develops means for assessing technology-enhanced courses, in consultation with experts in assessment and technology-enhanced education from within or outside the University, and promotes the sharing of these assessments across the schools;

- makes recommendations for instructional technology improvements to the Teaching Technology Committee;

- educates faculty on how decisions are made in this area at NYU; and

- reviews individual schools' initiatives in technology-enhanced education, to determine if a University-level strategy emerges and to prepare the University to respond to both challenges and opportunities that arise in this area.

(c) COMPOSITION. Every school should have one representative on the committee. School representatives should be faculty members chosen at the school level by whatever process the school adopts, provided that it involves consultation of the faculty. Schools may choose, e.g., to elect the members by existing processes or by new election processes adopted for this purpose, or to select members from a previously elected body. Ideally, the school's representative would be knowledgeable in the area of technology-enhanced education.

Additional faculty or ex officio members (e.g., administrators, council members, IT experts) shall be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the deans.

II. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FINAL REPORT

The committee has reviewed the Final Report recommendations in great detail. In the attached chart, the committee has given its best advice for how they should be implemented. Around one third of these recommendations have either been enacted already or are in the process of being enacted. Another third, we believe, should be remanded to the new standing committee, and final third should be remanded to other individuals or groups, including the standing Teaching Technology Committee.

Implementation Chart of FTEE Final Report Recommendations

Recommendation	Action
#1: Encourage individual faculty members, departments, and schools to experiment with technology-enhanced approaches to teaching, learning, and research.	*[See 1/2a-f below.]*
#2: Conduct research on and evaluate which technologies enhance student learning outcomes, for which subject areas, and under which conditions.	*[See 1/2a-f below.]*
(1/2a) Establish a competitive grant, along the lines of the existing Curriculum Development Challenge Fund, to support faculty who want to explore creative uses of technology in their courses; develop a set of criteria for evaluating submissions.	The new standing committee (see 3a below) should develop a mechanism for faculty to apply directly for high-level instructional technology support. Such applications could be reviewed by a selection committee established for this purpose.
(1/2b) Refrain from making high-level university-wide decisions at the present time about partnerships with MOOC consortia and full-service online providers, but continue to allow individual schools to pursue such relationships in consultation with the Provost. (Commitments with MOOC consortia should occur at the course level, and then only through the appropriate faculty governance mechanisms.)	DONE--No further action needed.

(1/2c) Develop NYU-specific versions of Open Education that make use of social media and video lectures; encourage development of peer-to-peer Open Education projects.	ONGOING--A number of projects are under development--e.g., NYYOU: The Knowledge Commons (University Enterprise Initiatives); NYU Tutors (University Enterprise Initiatives); a series of online, TED-like talks about effective pedagogical practices (CAT); and a library of filmed presentations/workshops about best practices in teaching (CAT).
(1/2d) Establish a Digital Education Research Center, with start-up funding over a three- to five-year period, to facilitate faculty research into technology-enhanced education, to disseminate research conducted here and elsewhere, and to serve as a resource for interested faculty.	ONGOING--The Provost has asked Dom Brewer (Steinhardt Dean) to explore the resources for research on digital education that are currently available in his school and throughout the University and to get back to him about the need and feasibility of a Digital Education Research Center.
(1/2e) Ensure that any technology-enhanced course supported by the University is assessed in terms of its impact on student learning, motivation, and related outcomes.	The new standing committee should consult with assessment and TEE experts from across or from outside the University to develop means for assessing technology-enhanced courses. It should be made clear that "assessment" in this case refers not to student course evaluations or other types of instructor assessment, but to assessing the impact of different technology-enhanced approaches on student learning. Finally, since we want to promote such assessments, faculty should be involved in designing them, and they should be required for any TEE experiments that receive University (as opposed to school-based) funding.

(1/2f) Review individual schools' initiatives in technology-enhanced education to determine if a University-level strategy emerges, and prepare the University to respond to both challenges and opportunities that arise in this area.	This is an ongoing goal, and the new standing committee should advise on how best to engage with schools about their TEE strategies. Schools should, however, have discretion about what information they share and how.
#3: Ensure broad-based input into decision-making about technology-enhanced education.	*[See 3a-b below.]*
(3a) Create a new standing committee to advise the University's decision-making in this area. The committee should include one faculty member from each NYU school, as well as representation from the Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Senators Council, the Non-Tenure-Track Contract Faculty Senators Council, and the Student Senators Council. In addition, instructional technology experts from ITS/GTS and the schools should be invited to join the meetings on an ex officio basis.	Every school should have one representative on the committee. School representatives should be faculty members chosen at the school level by whatever process the school adopts, provided that it involves consultation of the faculty. Schools may choose, e.g., to elect the members by existing processes or by new election processes adopted for this purpose, or to select members from a previously elected body. Ideally, the school's representative would be knowledgeable in the area of technology-enhanced education. Additional faculty or ex officio members (e.g., administrators, council members, IT experts) shall be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Deans. The committee's charge and its existing relationship to other existing committees dealing with teaching and learning as well as technology-enhanced education should be clearly delineated. The role of the committee should be advisory to the President and Provost. Minimally, it should monitor experimentation at the school-level, and will work closely with groups charged with evaluating such experiments.

(3b) Consult broadly with faculty, students, and staff on all matters regarding technology and education, using a variety of strategies, such as crowdsourcing, town halls, etc.	This should be remanded to the standing committee.
#4: Encourage schools, working through their faculty governance mechanisms, to review any restrictions they may have concerning students' ability to use technology-enhanced courses to fulfill program and degree requirements.	The Provost and/or the standing committee should pursue this with the Deans, or else wait until specific cases arise.
#5: (a) Circulate widely the relevant intellectual property and conflict policies (Conflict of Commitment and Conflict of Interest); (b) review them continuously to ensure that they reflect the emerging best practices for online works; and (c) ensure that faculty members understand their rights with regard to the resulting work.	This should be remanded to the Office of General Counsel, the Senior Vice Provost for Research, and the Vice President for University Enterprise Initiatives.
#6: Resolve key questions about data stewardship, to ensure that there is clarity about policies governing the use and management of the data generated by instructional technologies.	This should be remanded to IT, since the Vice President for Information Technology & Chief Information Technology Officer is working closely with the schools to coordinate the data stewardship initiative. While there will doubtless be certain all-University standards that emerge from this effort, others may be school-specific.
#7: Facilitate learning about available resources and the applications of instructional technology.	*[See 7a-b below.]*

(7a) Continue to assess and improve the Enhanced Service Model for Instructional Technology Support (ESMITS), which provides assistance at an institutional level for all instructors.	DONE--Assessments of and improvements to ESMITS are onging, and future assessments should be remanded to the Deputy Chief Global Technology Officer, who oversees ESMITS.
(7b) Ensure that there is at least one instructional technologist based in every school, and convene these individuals regularly with University-level IT staff, in order to coordinate initiatives. This group should take responsibility for: (a) continuing to address emerging support needs through the evaluation and assessment of instructional technology services; (b) reconfiguring the Committee's website into an online clearinghouse of information and resources for the NYU community about technology-enhanced education; (c) ensuring that online resources (e.g., the FAQs, the inventory of online and hybrid/blended courses, and the bibliography of articles about technology-enhanced education) are regularly updated; and (d) developing and disseminating, in collaboration with the proposed Digital Education Research Center, best practices for instructional uses of technology, especially standards for online courses.	ONGOING--Recruitment of school-based instructional technologists is well underway. Those who have been hired have already begun meeting (along with their University-level counterparts) as a subcommittee of the Teaching Technology Committee. In spring 2015, this subcommittee of instructional technologists began overseeing the development of four online training modules for faculty who wish to incorporate technology into their teaching. These modules are devoted to the following topics: Google Apps, streaming videos, NYU Classes, and classroom support.
(7c) Create physical and virtual spaces where faculty, instructional designers, and technologists can collaborate and experiment with new technologies for teaching and research, particularly across units.	We don't yet have a proposed course of action (though "virtual" spaces for collaboration and experimentation could be provided by NYYOU).

#8: Ensure that the development and renovation of classrooms and learning spaces takes into consideration both current and potential uses of technology in teaching and research.	*[See 8a-e below.]*
(8a) Take into account, when developing new general purpose classrooms, the ways in which the increasing use of instructional technology will shape the University's needs for teaching space (i.e., small or mid-sized spaces with state-of-the-art equipment, rather than large lecture halls).	This should be remanded to the Teaching Technology Committee.
(8b) Support experimentation with the design of new teaching and learning spaces and evaluate their impact on student learning and on instructor and student satisfaction.	This should be remanded to the Teaching Technology Committee.
(8c) Require departments and schools (including portal campuses and global sites), as they create new proprietary spaces or renovate existing ones, to do so in consultation with Classroom Media Services in the Division of Libraries and in accordance with standards developed for technology in general purpose classrooms.	Campus Media is compiling a list of all proprietary classrooms and the instructional technology in each of them--excluding specified rooms used, e.g., in the Medical School. Once this inventory is complete, the Provost and the Deans should work together to determine next steps--e.g., developing a cost-share method of upgrading these spaces, contingent upon the schools' giving the Registrar the ability to schedule these rooms whenever they are not being used by their owners.

(8d) Expedite completion of the Space Management System project.	*The Committee made this recommendation without full knowledge of either the scope or status of the Space Management System (SMS). Having subsequently consulted with the Executive Vice President for Operations, the Committee has revised this recommendation, as follows:* Once an inventory of technology in proprietary classrooms is available, the Executive Vice President for Operations, the Chief Informational Officer and Chief Global Informational Officer, the University Registrar, and the Associate Dean for Information Technology and University Media Services (Division of Libraries) should be asked to ensure that information about all classrooms and the technology in them is visible to departments as they request general purpose classrooms or assign proprietary spaces.
(8e) Continue to update and improve the technological infrastructure (e.g., bandwidth, stable wireless networks) on which many academic activities at NYU depend.	This should be remanded to IT. It would be desirable for IT to publish an annual report of upgrades to the University's technological infrastructure.
#9: Explore and support multi-locational teaching by faculty across NYU's global network	*[See 9a-b below.]*

(9a) Develop additional videoconference-equipped classrooms (both general purpose classrooms and proprietary spaces) throughout the global network, and provide instruction and staff support for the allocation and use of these spaces.	This should be remanded to the Teaching Technology Committee.
(9b) Provide pedagogical guidance and technical support for the use of web conferencing as a tool for teaching across NYU locations.	This should be remanded to the Teaching Technology Committee.