



eLearning Governance Group

Secretary: Sally Paynter

Room L4.20 Quadrangle, A14
Phone: 9351 5200; Fax: 9351 3572
E-mail: sallyp@usyd.edu.au

NOTICE OF MEETING

A meeting of the **eLearning Governance Group** will be held at **1pm** on **Thursday 19 July 2007** in the **Main Quadrangle Meeting Room A14** (opposite General Lecture Theatre 1, next door to the Chancellor's Office)

Members who are unable to attend are asked to notify Sally Paynter at the above address. Enquiries concerning this meeting may also be directed to Sally.

Sally Paynter
16 July 2007

Members

Professor Derrick Armstrong, Acting Deputy Provost (Learning and Teaching) Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Chair),
Professor Bruce Sutton, Chair Academic Board
Mr Bruce Meikle, Chief Information Officer,
Mr John Shipp, University Librarian,
Mr Andrew Cooper, Director Architecture and Technology,
Associate Professor Rob Ellis, Director of eLearning
Associate Professor Mark Freeman, Director Office of Learning and Teaching in Economics and Business
Ms Su Hanfling, Director Sciences and Technology Libraries
Mr Peter McGeorge, Assistant Director, Campus Property and Services
Associate Professor Mary Peet, Director of Learning and Teaching, Sciences and Technology

Agenda

1. Apologies

2. Minutes of previous meeting

(pages 3-5)

Recommendation

That the eLearning Governance Group adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 May 2007 as a true record.

3. Matters arising from Minutes (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)

4. Report of the Chair

Recommendation

That the eLearning Governance Group note the Chair's report.

5. Streaming Trial

(pages 6-13)

Associate Professor Rob Elis to report.

Recommendation

That the eLearning Governance Group note the report.

6. Infrastructure White Paper

Mr John Shipp, Mr Meikle and Associate Professor Rob Ellis to report.

Recommendation

That the eLearning Governance Group note the report.

7. Plagiarism

Professor Bruce Sutton to report.

Recommendation

That the eLearning Governance Group note the report.

8. ePortfolio

Associate Professor Rob Ellis to report.

Recommendation

That the eLearning Governance Group note the report.

9. Any other business

10. Next Meeting

Members are asked to note that the next meeting of the eLearning Governance Group will be held on Thursday 20 September 2007.

Agenda Item 2

Minutes of the eLearning Governance Group, Thursday 17 May 2007

There were present: The Chair of the eLearning Governance Group Professor Derrick Armstrong, Mr Andrew Cooper, Director Architecture and Technology, Associate Professor Rob Ellis, Director of eLearning, Associate Professor Mark Freeman, Director Office of Learning and Teaching in Economics and Business, Mr Bruce Meikle, Chief Information Officer, Mr John Shipp University Librarian, Associate Professor Peter McCallum, Deputy Chair Academic Board and Mr Peter McGeorge, Assistant Director, CP&S. Ms Sally Paynter was in attendance.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from: Mr Andrew Cooper and Ms Su Hanfling, Director Sciences and Technology Libraries.

2. Chair's report

The Chair advised that he had nothing on which to report.

3. Streaming project recommendations

Associate Professor Ellis spoke to the report advising that the streaming solution would be working towards improving the quality of the University's online learning environment which would include streamlining files, podcasting, RSS feeds, downloading files and real time interaction. As was agreed at the February meeting the budget for the project would be \$490,000. The key stakeholders from the Learning and Teaching Community and the Senior executive had been consulted and given an opportunity to provide feedback.

Vendors were invited to provide presentations based on the following criteria

- Nearly full automation from capture through to use by the student;
- Robustness and the reliability of the system;
- Sustainability and cost effectiveness;
- Scalability and whether it can grow with faculty demands;
- Quality assurance for learning and teaching including fit for purpose file types; and
- Appropriateness of fit for academic content.

The vendors were grouped into two categories, those that offered real time broadcasts including virtual tutorial rooms and online real time images, chat and audio and those that offered object orientated solutions. The project group evaluated each vendor against the elimination criteria and only three vendors were able to show the interface that was ready to use three vendors, Electroboard/Starbak, Lectopia/Apple and Adobe connect/breeze. The two vendors provided a solution that fitted academic needs well and were not attempting to manipulate a corporate model to fit an academic context. Associate Professor Ellis explained the three options to the Group and advised that after careful consideration the project group recommended the use of the Lectopia/Apple solutions as it showed a very deep interface, gave clear diagnosis on screen if students were experiencing difficulty accessing the system and offered multiple file types and was compatible for students who were using both PC and Macs.

The Group discussed the following three recommendations

1. *that the Lectopia/Apple solution be trialed to establish academic, policy and operational processes around it as phase 1 in Semester 2, 2007. This trial would provide a comprehensive report to eLearning Governance at end of 2007*

Members discussed the first recommendation and raised the following points during discussion:

- a trial of the Lectopia system in semester two 2007 would be managed within of 10 teaching spaces (8 large, 2 small) and from teachers desktops;

- two staff would be needed to support the trial, an HEO 7 position to assist vide-conferencing, scheduling and managements and HEO 5 to assist AV manager;
 - a weakness in all the systems is that if a teacher forgets to attach their lapel microphone or forgets to switch it off after the session there can be inappropriate content recorded;
 - students would not be downloading whole files but instead they would be streamed and buffered;
 - copyright issues would have to be managed and conveyed to academics;
 - faculties would be invited to participate in the trial and would provide a short evaluation report on teacher and student experience; and
 - it was important to manage the scheduling of the trial to ensure quality and to match the expectations of teachers and concepts.
2. *that the Lectopia/Apple solution be rolled out as phases 2 & 3 in 2008 /2009 in line with the recommendations from the report on the trial from semester 2, 2007. Some care should be adopted in relation to the total number of rooms supported as lectopia-enabled for planning in 2009. This should be related to faculty-demand and central workload arising from first 18 months of use*

The Group noted that the results of the trials conducted by faculties would be evaluated and that when the Lectopia/Apple solution was rolled out faculties would be responsible for providing coherent guidelines for its use. The Chair advised that he was concerned about ad hoc evaluations conducted by faculties and that the result may be an ad hoc approach to the solutions development. Members agreed that a systematic evaluation needed to be made and from this a policy would need to be developed with a broader range of questions which extended beyond whether students liked the technology to how they interacted with it. The evaluation would be sent back to the eLearning Governance Group for discussion.

It was noted that Macquarie and Griffith universities had conducted a similar trial and had positive results with greater than 80-90% of students attending lectures and then using the eLearning tools to reinforce what they had learnt.

Members noted that an evaluation of the whole trial would be reported to the eLearning Governance Group at the end of 2007.

3. *that Adobe Connect (Breeze) Licensing be continued into 2008*

Members noted that there was still a demand for Adobe Connect (Breeze) and that it was recommended that the licensing be continued until 2008. After this time the Breeze manager would report on the demand, usage and expenditure of the program. Associate Professor Ellis explained that Breeze was intrinsically very different to how the Lectopia/Apple solution worked and that at scale; it is a series of virtual tutorial rooms rather than a process of capturing audio and video learning objects. Breeze is used by managers for virtual meetings and by a comparatively small number of staff seeking support for post graduate students or students studying predominately off campus.

The Chair suggested that the evaluation of the Breeze program be revised and that a working party be formed to assist in evaluating the need to continue the licensing agreement.

The Group noted the budget for the implementation of the three recommendations and confirmed that this included the costs of implementation. Other budgetary requirements including storage needs and other IT needs would be identified once the faculty trials had concluded.

The eLearning Governance Group resolved to support all three recommendations relating to the streaming project.

4. eLearning support for faculties – expression of interest process

Associate Professor Ellis reported on the call for expressions of interest for 2008 strategic eLearning development projects. Members noted that there was lots of enthusiasm for the development of eLearning projects but that there was little time available to develop them because staff were busy and it was often difficult to turn educational goals into eLearning projects. Associate Professor Ellis advised that the *Guidelines for Strategic eLearning Development Projects: Call for Expressions of Interest for 2008 Projects* had been circulated to Associate Deans (Learning and Teaching) in each faculty and college and all were encouraged to apply by submitting a paragraph about the proposal by 27 July and then a written expression of interest by 28 September. The projects would be developed in Semesters 1 or 2, 2008. Members noted that between July and September advice would be sought about how feasible the projects were and eLearning staff would be deployed to work with Faculty staff to develop their proposals. The Group noted that there were currently 30-40 eLearning projects being developed and that there was more demand than resources for faculties wanting to develop eLearning projects.

A question was raised about the whether it would be more beneficial to develop one large project per faculty cluster rather than many smaller projects and whether these projects were based on the overall goals of the University. The Chair advised that the selection panel considering the strategic eLearning development project would adhere to strict guidelines which ensured that projects which reflected the University's key performance indicators would be selected over those that did not.

5. Any other business

There was no other business.

Agenda item 5

Streaming Solution for Learning and Teaching - Trial, semester 2, 2007

As part of the learning and teaching program for 2007, an enterprise streaming solution is being rolled out. This is a joint project between the Office of the Deputy Provost (Learning and Teaching) and the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

The definition of the streaming solution for the 2007 program is in relation to the variety of demands coming from sixteen faculties. Streaming is broadly defined to include streaming of files, podcasting, RSS feeds, downloading files and real time interaction. For that reason, Governance endorsed the purchase of three types of technologies: Lectopia (for in teaching space recordings and recordings from desktops); codian (to supplement the existing video-conferencing system to enable recording of live video-conferencing sessions). Governance also endorsed the continuation of the Breeze licence until the end of 2008 to determine its role and scope when user demand from lectopia and codian is better understood.

The trial for semester 2, 2007 is a trial of the management and support systems surrounding these technologies and their relationship to existing infrastructure.

Learning background

The main purpose of the streaming solution is to facilitate student learning. The most likely uses of the solution is to enable review of concepts and learning experiences that would otherwise be difficult to distribute in a sustainable manner to over 40 000 students. The challenge for the university is to integrate the streaming solution into the learning and teaching infrastructure in ways that do not make the solution overly complicated for teacher/student-users, nor that it puts too much pressure on the AV/ICT infrastructure which is currently in planning phases to be upgraded in relation to campus-wide planning with CP&S, IT and Teaching and Learning.

There are two main sources for learning resources that will be enabled by the lectopia solution; recordings captured in centrally-bookable teaching spaces, and recordings made at the desktops of teachers.

Infrastructure background

The University has approximately 280 centrally-bookable rooms, divided into around 85 large spaces (>70), 170 medium spaces (20<medium<70) and the rest small spaces (small <20), with more coming on-line over the next few years.

Recordings captured in centrally-bookable teaching spaces

Benchmarks for lectopia-enabled spaces in centrally-bookable rooms in Australian Universities include the University of Melbourne, with 65 lectopia-enabled rooms, and the University of Western Australia, with around 45 lectopia-enabled rooms. These support between 200-400 recordings a week

The trial for lectopia-enabled rooms for semester 2, 2007 will involve 10 large spaces. The quality of the AV/ICT infrastructure at present means that up to 30 rooms will be enabled in 2008, with some additional rooms being added to this number depending on spaces coming on-line over the next few years.

Recordings captured from desktops

Depending on the success from the outcomes of the trial of desktop recordings, the intention is to make this source of lectopia-enabled activities to be available to any teacher wishing to avail themselves of the solution. The ongoing budget for the streaming solution should reflect a volume or site licence for an enterprise-supported editing software for streaming files.

The trial in semester 2 2007 will be looking into how files are recorded from desktops, with what software, and how they can end up in an automated fashion in one of three learning management systems.

Legacy recordings: the Library

University stakeholders in the streaming solution hold a number of existing recordings. One major stakeholder, the Library, has a variety of resources which they wish to stream to users across all faculties. Depending on the content of the files, these streamed resources could use any of the three enterprise learning management systems, or they may be streamed through a standardised portal.

Trialling user experiences

The trial of the streaming solution is a complex one, involving the adoption of many perspectives;

- a student-learning perspective
- a teacher perspective preparing and teaching in a centrally-bookable space
- a teacher perspective preparing and recording from a desktop
- a technical perspective ensuring the functionalities operate at enterprise levels
- a library perspective streaming legacy recordings
- a legal perspective looking at issues related to copyright
- an administrative perspective looking at sustainability, costs and management of legal issues, access issues related to streaming resources off main campus (eg in other teaching campuses)
- a staff training perspective
- a policy perspective looking at a policy-led framework for the deployment of the solution

Scope of Trial

While the trial in semester 2 will be a good place to begin investigations into these issues, the trial should be seen as the first step into a broader institutional understanding and experience of what it takes to integrate streaming technologies at an enterprise level that involves some cultural change in the way we support students and teachers. For this reason, many of the questions below will be continuously relevant over the next few years as we move towards a better understanding of how to use streaming resources most effectively to support student understanding.

Key evaluation questions

Evaluation - Student Focus Groups

- a. What do students think they learn through streaming resources?
- b. How do students approach the use of streaming resources?
- c. Why do they use the streaming resources in the way they do?
- d. When and where do they use streaming resources?
- e. Will students stop going to lectures if they receive streaming lectures?
- f. Other

Evaluation– Teaching Space recordings

- a. To what extent might a teacher adjust the way they prepare for teaching in a centrally-bookable space when they know that the experience is to be captured?
- b. What advice should a teacher have before preparing materials for a teaching session that is to be recorded for streaming?
- c. What does a teacher have to do to start, pause and then continue a recording?
- d. To what extent can an AV assistant be used for booked video-camera recordings?
- e. Other

Evaluation – desktop recordings

- a) What is the list of possible editing softwares? Which pass a cost/benefit evaluation?
- b) Which file production and editing software is sufficiently user-friendly and cost effective to be supported university-wide?
- c) What advice should a teacher have before preparing materials for a teaching session that is to be recorded for streaming?
- d) What file types can go without change into conversion process?
- e) What costs are associated with converting file types?
- f) What staff training is required for desktop production?
- g) Other

Evaluation– Technical administration

- a. To what extent can files be accessed at other teaching campuses?
- b. To what extent can the recording of files occur at other teaching campuses?
- c. What source captures (audio, video, data-projector) works technically well in large teaching spaces?
- d. What are the technical risks in capturing a fit-for-purpose file for streaming?
- e. How automated is the process from capture, processing, to multiple file types in an LMS? (WebCT, Blackboard & Medicine LMSs)
- f. How reliable is the scheduled appearance of multiple file types in the three LMSs?
- g. Is the enterprise architecture robust, reliable, sustainable, extensible?
- h. What is the role and scope of the HEO7 and HEO5 support people in the streaming solution?
- i. What is the role and scope of responsibilities of the Streaming system administrator and the AV/ICT coordinator in the streaming solution?
- j. Which of the options for a desktop authoring solution are most user-friendly and cost-effective?
- k. Other

Evaluation – legacy recordings

1. What is the process to effectively integrating legacy recordings into the streaming solution?
2. What are the costs of integrating files into the streaming solution?
3. What is the criteria by which major stakeholders such as the library decide on which LMS or portal to use to stream resources?
What guidelines do faculties require if they intend to stream legacy recordings?
4. What are the adjustments, if any, to Library cataloguing streamed resources?
5. other

Evaluation – policy and training implications

- a. What are the copyright issues and strategies involved?

- b. What do other universities do to manage copyright?
- c. What splash screens are required?
- d. What sign offs from teachers wishing to use the service are needed?
- e. What information do teachers need before they can sign off using the service?
- f. What training do teachers require?
- g. How will the training fit into existing training programs?
- h. Other

Evaluation - Codian

- a. How often do teachers require video conferences to be recorded?
- b. Why do they want the recordings?
- c. What do they do with the recordings?
- d. How do students approach the use the video conferencing recordings? What do they do and why?
- e. What are the QA issues for learning and teaching with video conferencing recordings?

Evaluation – Adobe Breeze

- f. How is Breeze being used in units of study?
- g. How much is Breeze being used in units of study?
- h. How is Breeze being used for meetings?
- i. How much is Breeze being used for meetings?
- j. What are the QA issues for learning and teaching when Breeze is used?
- k. Other

Trial schedule in summary

<i>Stage</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Brief Description</i>
1	By end July	Technical equipment delivered to campus
2	By end August	Technical infrastructure in place
3	By end October	Trialing of infrastructure across 10 rooms, three LMSs and multiple desktops
4	November-December	Report on trial provided to Governance

ICT are working hard to get infrastructure in place by end of August. The trial period is a 2 month period between September and October. A report on the trial is planned for eLearning Governance the end of the year.

Trial teaching spaces

Teaching spaces involved in the trial have been chosen based on;

- Suitability of existing infrastructure
- High volume use by timetabling
- Teachers who are willing to be part of the trial teach in those spaces during the trial period.

See appendix 1 for a list of spaces.

Trial desktop recordings

A number of software applications will be trailed for desktop recordings. These will be chosen based on the following criteria;

- User-friendliness

- PC and Mac compatible
- Cost effectiveness
- If feasible, able to be used for both pre and post editing of files.
- A support model for teacher use is sustainable

An emerging list of post-production softwares is in appendix 3.

The coordinator of the desktop software trial is Colin Lowe c.lowe@usyd.edu.au

Breeze and Codian trials

The infrastructure portfolio in ICT is coordinating the trials of Breeze and Codian. Details of these trials will be made available as the infrastructure and support models are put in place.

The coordinator of the Breeze and Codian technology trials is Rafik Razzouk rrazzouk@usyd.edu.au

Oversight of trial documentation and processes

The coordinator of the trial documentation and processes is Dr Tai Peseta tpeseta@itl.usyd.edu.au of ITL.

Appendix 1

Lectopia Trial - Potential Venues							
No	Venue Name	Suggested Priority	Building Code	Building Name	Room #	Capacity	Slope
1	Footbridge Theatre	1	A09	Holme Building		700	TIERED
2	Wallace Theatre	2	A21	Wallace Theatre	200	555	TIERED
3	Eastern Avenue Auditorium	3	F19	Eastern Avenue Complex	101	500	TIERED
4	Institute Lecture Theatre 1	4	H03	Institute	N295	276	TIERED
5	Quadrangle Building, General Lecture Theatre N205	5	A14	Quadrangle Building	N205	261	TIERED
6	Electrical Eng Madsen Theatre 351	6	J03	Electrical Engineering	351	150	TIERED
7	Education Lecture Theatre 351	8	A35	Education Building	351	148	TIERED
8	Bosch Lecture Theatre 3	9	D04	Bosch 1A	297	300	TIERED
9	Bosch Lecture Theatre 4	11	D04	Bosch 1A	299	300	TIERED
10	Merewether Lecture Room 5 (Rm 277)	22	H04	Merewether	277	135	FLAT
11	School of Information Technology - Presentation Room	10	J12	SIT	123	80	TIERED
12	Slade Lecture Theatre (in Physics bld)	7	A28	Physics	217	150	TIERED
13	Quadrangle Building, Latin 1 S224	12	A14	Quadrangle Building	S224	176	FLAT
14	Carslaw Lecture Theatre 175	13	F07	Carslaw	175	160	TIERED
15	Carslaw Lecture Theatre 273	14	F07	Carslaw	273	160	TIERED
16	Carslaw Lecture Theatre 275	15	F07	Carslaw	275	160	TIERED
17	Carslaw Lecture Theatre 373	16	F07	Carslaw	373	160	TIERED
18	Carslaw Lecture Theatre 375	17	F07	Carslaw	375	160	TIERED
19	Physics Lecture Theatre 1	18	A28	Physics	405	154	TIERED

20	Physics Lecture Theatre 1	19	A28	Physics	405	154	TIERED
21	Quadrangle Building, Oriental Room S204	20	A14	Quadrangle Building	S204	150	FLAT
22	Physics Lecture Theatre 2	21	A28	Physics	424	142	TIERED
23	Electrical Eng Lecture Theatre 2 (Rm 450)	23	J03	Electrical Engineering	450	120	TIERED
24	Education Lecture Room 424	24	A35	Education Building	424	100	TIERED
25	Institute Lecture Room 2	25	H03	Institute	N296	100	FLAT
26	Quadrangle Building, Philosophy Room S249	26	A14	Quadrangle Building	S249	100	FLAT
27	Physics Lecture Theatre 5	27	A28	Physics	321	93	TIERED
28	Quadrangle Building, Latin 2 S225	28	A14	Quadrangle Building	S225	90	FLAT
29	Quadrangle Building, McRae Room S418	29	A14	Quadrangle Building	S418	85	FLAT
30	Quadrangle Building, Room S421	30	A14	Quadrangle Building	S421	50	FLAT

Key

	Proposed Venues for Teaching Space Trial
--	--

Appendix 2 - File Formats that can be automatically processed by the Lectopia solution

- QuickTime (and all available export components/codecs)
- MPEG4 Audio (AAC, MP4, M4A, M4B)
- MPEG4 Video
- Windows Media
- 3GP (for mobile phones)
- MP3
- AVI
- AIFF
- WAV
- DV Video

Appendix 3 – Post production editing software of lectopia files

- QuickTime Pro
- Final Cut Pro
- iMovie
- Avid Liquid
- Media 100

Appendix 4 - Software for preparing lectopia files at desktops

- QuickTime Pro
- Final Cut Pro
- iMovie
- Avid Liquid
- Media 100
- Camtasia