

Minutes of Meeting January 26<sup>th</sup>, 2012

Approved April 6, 2012

Final

Committee Attendees: Bawn, Domingo, Hardinger, Lew, Loehner, Mamer (Chair), Reiff, Snyder

---

1. Notes from 12/7/11 were approved without changes.
2. Review of clicker usage data and discussion of standardization or endorsement.

The committee reviewed data provided by the bookstore showing current clicker sales for courses ordering clickers through the bookstore. The chief complaint is that because UCLA has not standardized on a clicker vendor the volume of clicker sales on campus is spread amongst 3-5 different vendors and clickers are costing roughly \$45 each. Additionally, some students have had to purchase 3 different types of clickers through the course of their career and resale to the bookstore is hampered by the uncertainty that a particular clicker vendor will be used by a class in the future. It was theorized that if the campus were to make an endorsement of a particular clicker vendor this could lower the cost for students and this lower cost in turn would ease one of the barriers to faculty adoption of the technology.

The committee felt that cost should not trump pedagogy. The campus should not dictate which type of clicker a faculty member should use. For example, if someone has built their course around certain features of one particular clicker they should not be required to switch to a clicker with fewer features on the basis of cost savings. During the discussion it was also stated that dedicated clickers are most likely a transitional technology and that eventually the functions performed by clickers will be taken over by multi-function devices such as smartphones. In fact, UCLA is working on just that via its Mobile Web Framework.

It was suggested that OI do a document stating the different options of the various clickers to help faculty make an informed decision. This document could also include a version of the bookstore data so that faculty would not only know what is available but also what clicker is already used by courses that might have overlapping student populations.

The committee recognized that the only reason we were discussing standardization is the cost of the clickers and that the rising total cost of education to the students is making everyone sensitive to additional costs. If the cost of a clicker was \$2 we would not feel a need to dictate which clicker a faculty should use. Given that the market for clickers is still evolving, the committee felt it best not to issue an endorsement of a particular type.

(Due to illness, Rose Rocchio was unable to give the committee an update on the Mobile Web Framework and their work towards a mobile and web-based clicker solution. This will be rescheduled for a future date)

3. Electronic Exam Return System

UCI has had for several years an electronic exam return system. The committee considered whether something like this would be desirable to pilot at UCLA.

In terms of the benefits provided by an electronic exam return system, students are more likely to look at the exam feedback on an electronically delivered exam than if they had to go someplace physically to pick up the graded exam. They are also more likely to get the feedback in a timely manner. Other benefits include not being able to alter answers on the returned exam and examples of student work could be saved for program review or accreditation purposes. However, it may also have a side effect of increasing pressure on faculty and TAs to write more comments.

In discussing this service with the committee it was evident that some faculty and even departments would find this desirable however the cost of the service would severely impact the demand. At UCI the charge for this service is \$0.05/page. There was some talk of subsidizing such a service, for example only for large courses, but this was also rejected. In the end, the committee felt that at UCLA this would pilot better as a service that some departments might be able to add if there was some relatively inexpensive 'kit' that would allow them to do some smaller scale electronic return system but not a centralized service for a fee. Michelle Lew from OID will investigate the feasibility of a small scale electronic return system kit for departments.

#### 4. OIPP update

Several groups on campus are examining online instruction both originating from UCOP and locally. In addition to the FCET, the ITPB, the College FEC and the Senate's Undergraduate Council are each discussing different aspects of online instruction (e.g., cost, expectations, audience, and impact on infrastructure). It is clear that online instruction is something we feel is valuable for our students; what is not as clear is the value to the outside markets being pursued by OIPP.

The committee decided to focus its own efforts on positive things that can be learned from the two online courses at UCLA that are currently part of the OIPP project. The committee will work to come up with a list of questions that it feels it would like answered about online instruction, while recognizing that not all of the questions will be answered by the two projects. In addition, the committee hopes to engage other online UCLA courses in this search for answers. For example there are several online History courses being planned for summer session and the discussion could also be expanded to 'flipped' and hybrid classes. The goal will be to survey the small sample of online courses already taking place and try to come up with a realistic model that addresses issues like what resources are required, what the costs are and the amount of support needed.