EDX ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES

GROUP 1 | ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Monday, May 16, 2016
12:00 - 1:00 PM
Eastman Hall, Room 1300

PRESENT: Arena, Blizzard, Bryant, Craig, Elliot, Kray, Marini, Parry-Hill, Yacci

EXCUSED: D’Arcangelo, Hair, Hannigan, Stavoli, Wahl

Follow-up from meeting on 3 sub-groups that reviewed MIT, Dartmouth, and the draft LOA for Videogame design

J. Arena and a group met with the faculty in Videogame Design.

D. Blizzard: We need plan of action for the summer. Fortunately, we now have more time [see full council notes from 5.11.16]. I know some of us are on 9 ½ month contracts and others 12. If we can be open about what we would like to do as a group, my thought is that we have a small group meeting a few times over the summer.

[Viewed the IIL newsletter] – comments?

P. Craig: We are not trying to be secretive, this helps show that, and that the only reason people are not invested is their choice.

L. Bryant: I can show this to my chairs at a retreat next week, but I am not sure my deaf faculty be able to follow. When using caption and also showing things on a screen, the deaf and HoH cannot follow. In the future, I suggest the creator try to view without sound. This will help see what the deaf may not be able to interpret, such as talking over visuals. Deaf will miss things, or may become confused as to what to view, the captioning, or the screen action.

D. Blizzard: This should be one of our primary goals, to make this more accessible.

J. Parry-Hill: This feedback is great.

D. Blizzard: Lisa, do you have anything to add to that?
L. Elliot: When I viewed this before our meeting, I found that I had to click “on” captions. This should be open and imposed on the video and in larger font. We should not make people have to work for accessibility, it should be there.

C. Kray: Should be proof read too, some sentences between the different speakers should have been separated.

J. Parry-Hill: Even if captions open by default, the text is still too small?

- Burn in captions to make sure they are not competing with graphics.

L. Bryant: Is there a Universal Design for font sizes?

J. Parry-Hill: Not sure, I will check. To improve the default level of captioning, this will cost something, so we need to consider this as an extra layer.

Sub-Group Reports:

**MIT Group:**

L. Elliott:
- MIT’s information is readily available and based on ideas in their strategic plan, so it aligned with larger goals for their university.
- Faculty were instructed to develop goals that align with their department.
- They developed an IP policy and guidelines and the Office of Digital Learning is the gatekeeper.
- They offer grants for development.
- It is not clear what the grant availability and qualifications are.
- They are required to sign an IP form, revenue guidelines indicate that 115% of any revenue goes to faculty and beyond that, any leftover goes to the teaching group, the ones who created the material.
- There are guidelines for teams and how that money is dispersed.
- There are not any specifics as to when and how they make money.

Lisa will place the guidelines discussed on the wiki page.

Mike D’Arcangelo, who can’t be here, was going to look at our SP and how this fits in.

J. Parry-Hill: the SP is the “Value of Digital Learning” on MIT’s website.
Dartmouth Group:

M. Yacci:
- The Office of Sponsored Projects has ownership of IP.
- Anything created while at Dartmouth is the property of Dartmouth, BUT they exclude the following: literary work, comp work, etc.
- There are special circumstances, where the college makes extraordinary investment, then the college owns copyright. Expenses come off the top and then the profits are split 50/50.

MIT spells out a team or department. It makes the most sense to spell it all out. In book deals, you can spell out specific percentages per person. It makes sense that it could be spelled out in more detail, especially if done by a team.

L. Bryant: Not knowing the vision yet, but assuming we go the traditional route, there will be nothing to share. It’s just out there a free massive open online course – no verification, no series.

D. Blizzard: Maybe we just do the bare bones, in anticipation of, and knowing that we can go back if necessary, but at least we have a place holder.

L. Bryant: That is where I like to have a general fund, to offset costs. Faculty need money.

J. Taylor: Lea Stavoli & I have that broken down, so we have a high level draft model that we will keep tweaking as things come up. There will be money for course dev, etc.

D. Blizzard: We need to determine how.

J. Arena: I image we will know what these are going into, maybe different types, revenue vs marketing, to offer different incentives depending upon the course objective.

E. Marini: Why did RIT get invested? At Dartmouth, they only want edX as a benefit to classes, improvement, no monetary or extracurricular reason. They are using it as a platform to better current classes, to retrain. [Per their FAQ page]

M. Yacci: Sooner or later, we do need to figure out what RIT wants to get out of this. Freebee 3 week courses, what is the benefit?

Draft LOA review:

J. Arena:
- I met with Steve Jacobs, he is overseeing all of the courses that are part of the Videogame Design XSeries, he not creating all content.
- He has a LOA they are working on, to be approved by provost. The one we have is a skeleton and it will be interesting to see what the final agreed upon one looks like.
- Steve shared a lot of info with regard to class creation, resources, and scaling up the project.
- No process in place yet
- I am interested in creating a process – how can we get this stuff done in the LOA.

J. Parry-Hill: We should maybe meet more often, as a sub-sub group, to discuss more.

M. Yacci: We Don’t need to reinvent anything, there are standard processes we can use. The notion of educational outcomes, new materials to create, interactions, systems, the literature is so overwrought.

L. Bryant: Do we have tools to give him to help him keep track of what he is doing?

J. Arena: HR Resources, not sure if this will scale up until we get it out there.

D. Blizzard: Seems we have 3 questions;
1. Who is going to do the course (how chosen, RFP)
2. How are they valued (pow, with chair)
3. The process, what will LOA look like, assure due course.

M. Yacci: Curricular oversight of these things- if becomes substantial – needs to be reviewed internally. Need to have curricular oversight –

D. Blizzard: Can that be part of the who does it and how are they valued?

M. Yacci: Is this subject matter valuable to students?

J. Arena: Address in the RFP. One take away, is that this is to be quick and nimble, let’s not weigh this down. We can handle this in small committees, and not institute wide.

L. Bryant: MIT has a task force, RFP sub to them.

**Next steps:**

Information gathered will be added to the EAC wiki pages.

Deb to schedule a core group meeting sometime over the summer, perhaps one longer summer meeting to include lunch, where we can begin typing something up, as a living document.