Homage to Dwight D. Eisenhower

Five Star General, War Hero, 34th president of the US... and university president.

“General, the faculty are the university!”
Great Expectations

Both the processing and the uses of information are undergoing an unprecedented technological revolution. Not only are machines now able to deal with many kinds of information at high speed and in large quantities, but it is also possible to manipulate these quantities so as to benefit from them in new ways. This is perhaps nowhere truer than in the field of education. One can predict that in a few years, millions of schoolchildren will have access to what Philip of Macedon’s son Alexander enjoyed as a royal prerogative: the services of a tutor as well-informed and as responsive as Aristotle.

Patrick Suppes
Scientific American
October, 1966

Great Expectations II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>percentage who agree/strongly agree</th>
<th>CAOs</th>
<th>CIOs</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital curricular learning resources provide a richer and more personalized learning experience</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than traditional print materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital curricular learning resources make learning more efficient and effective for students.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty here strongly support the role of technology to enhance teaching and instruction.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The senior academic leadership at my institution understands the strategic value of investments in</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT infrastructure, institutional resources, and services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAOs and CIOs have great expectations for digital pedagogy; faculty, not so much!

SOURCES
Green, Provosts, Pedagogy & Digital Learning, 2017 (CAO data)
Green, Campus Computing, 2016 (CIO data)
Green, Going Digital 2016 (faculty data)
What is Digital Learning?

Digital courseware is a solution with the potential to support student-centered learning at scale in postsecondary education. While millions of students use digital courseware today in their college courses, significant opportunity remains for effective digital courseware use to support new teaching and learning strategies, improve course accessibility, and drive improvements in learning outcomes for postsecondary students.

Courseware in Context

Digital courseware is instructional content that is scoped and sequenced to support delivery of an entire course through purpose-built software. It includes assessment to inform personalization of instruction and is equipped for adoption across a range of institutional types and learning environments.

Online Learning Consortium

What is Digital Learning?

I cannot define it, but I know it when I see it.

Justice Potter Stewart
Jacobellis v. Ohio (1964)
Insanity

Doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different outcome.

Gateway courses are American higher education’s Bermuda Triangle into which thousands of students enter, never to be seen again.

John W. Gardner
John W. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education

Technology is a Conversation About Change

How many psychologists does it take to change a light bulb?
NONE!
The light bulb must WANT to change.
Teaching is a “High Touch” Profession

Learning is a Personal Experience

Wisdom from the Software Industry

The Innovator’s Dilemma

God could create the world in seven days . . .
because there were no legacy systems
and there were no legacy users.

What are the legacy systems in education?
Technology is a Metaphor for Change

Technology is also a metaphor for risk.

Technology is a means of **uncertainty reduction** that is made possible by the cause-effect relationships upon which the technology is based . . . .

A technological innovation creates a kind of uncertainty (about its expected consequences) in the minds of potential adopters, as well as representing an opportunity for reduced uncertainty in another sense (reduced by the information base of the technology) . . . .

Thus, the innovation-decision process is essentially an information-seeking and information-processing activity in which the individual is motivated to reduce uncertainty about the advantages and disadvantages of the innovation.

---

**The Innovation Curve**

**• INNOVATORS:** Venturesome; cosmopolitan; they can cope with uncertainty; not always influential.

**• EARLY ADOPTERS:** Greatest degree of opinion leadership; respected; serve as role models for others; help off-set uncertainty among others.

**• EARLY MAJORITY:** Deliberate choices; longer decision cycle; links to late majority.

**• LATE MAJORITY:** Traditional, cautious and skeptical; may adopt out of necessity. Innovation must be safe.

**• LAGGARDS:** No roles as opinion leaders; they reference the past not the future. Must be certain that innovation will not fail.

Source: Everett M. Rogers, The Diffusion of Innovation
Technology is Disruptive

Issues & Impacts
- Organizational practice & process
- Individual behaviors and preferences
- Visualization: can I see me/us doing that?

Response
- Denial
- Anger
- Bargaining
- Depression
- Acceptance

On Death and Dying
Elizabeth Kübler-Ross

CAOs and CIOs
Rating the Effectiveness of Campus IT Investments

Disappointing assessments from both CAOs and CIOs about the effectiveness of campus IT investments

Source: Green, Provosts, Pedagogy and Digital Learning, Fall 2017
Green, Campus Computing 2017
The Key Campus Tech Issues are No Longer about IT

- IT is the “easy part” of technology on campus
- THE CHALLENGES: People, planning, policy, programs, priorities, silos, egos, and IT entitlements

The Instructional Challenge
How do we make Digital Learning compelling and safe for the faculty?

- Document the evidence of impact
- Provide much-needed support, recognition, and reward for faculty
- Communicate the effectiveness of and need for IT resources

Visualization

Underlying Issues
Can I do this? Why should I do this? Evidence of benefit?
Innovation, Infrastructure and Digital Learning
Kenneth C. Green • The Campus Computing Project

What Have We Learned Over Four Decades?

plus ça change
The more things change, the more things stay the same.

Technological Change
- Hardware
- Software
- Internet
- Wireless
- Mobile
- Analytics
- Social Media

Continuing Challenges
- Managing Expectations
- Training & User Support
- Instructional Integration
- Evidence of Impact
- Money / IT Budgets

The (Educational) Innovator’s Ecosystem

Innovation does not occur in a vacuum

Successful (effective) innovation depends on an ecosystem
- Backend infrastructure
- Front-end user support
- Alliances
- Supplanting current practice

Colorado Regional DIGITAL LEARNING SYMPOSIUM
© Kenneth C. Green, 2019
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Mapping the Textbook Industry

Textbooks: The Ecosystem Can Also Be a Fortress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backend Infrastructure</th>
<th>Alliances that Add Value</th>
<th>User Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Sales Reps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Teacher’s Guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Designers</td>
<td>Cross-Licensing</td>
<td>Student Handbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Specialists</td>
<td>Technology providers</td>
<td>Test Sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Web Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Call Centers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplement / Supplant Requirements

- Accreditation
- Standards/Regs
- Curricular Sequences

Alliances that Add Value

- Content
- Distribution
- Cross-Licensing
- Technology providers

User Support

- Sales Reps
- Teacher’s Guides
- Student Handbooks
- Test Sets
- Web Sites
- Conferences
- Communities
- Call Centers

Source: Green, Innovation and Infrastructure (2013)

False Choices: High Tech vs. High Touch

Whenever new technology is introduced into society, there must be a counterbalancing human response that is high touch or the technology is rejected. The more high tech, the more high touch.

John Naisbitt
Megatrends, 1982

Five Key Elements of an Effective Campus eLearning Plan

- Realistic Definitions and Expectations
- Faculty Recognition and Reward
- Training and User Support
- Evidence of Impact
- Sustained Support for IT, Innovation, and Infrastructure
**Tech Enabled High Touch**

**Baccalaureates for Baristas**
- Launched in 2014
- Starbucks employees complete degrees at ASU Online
- Counseling and support services are a critical supplement to the course experience.

**Eliminating the Graduation Gap at Georgia State**
- Innovative use of analytics to eliminate the graduation gap between minority and white students: 1700 more graduates annually vs. five years ago
- “Monday morning emails followed by 3,000 hours of counseling and support services”

**Math Accelerator**
- 600 computers in clusters at a redeveloped mall
- Adaptive learning technology from McGraw Hill
- Faculty on the floor working directly with students

**Changing the Data Culture**

Culture eats change for breakfast.

*CHANGE THE CULTURE OF DATA*

- **OLD:** What did YOU do wrong?
- **NEW:** How do WE do better?

Use data as a resource, not as a weapon

*Peter Drucker*
Innovation, Infrastructure and Digital Learning
Kenneth C. Green • The Campus Computing Project

Innovation and the Fear of Trying

If trustees, presidents, provosts, deans, and department chairs really want to address the fear of trying and foster innovation in instruction, then they have to recognize that infrastructure fosters innovation. And infrastructure, in the context of technology and instruction, involves more than just computer hardware, software, digital projectors in classrooms, learning management systems, and campus web sites. The technology is actually the easy part. The real challenges involve a commitment to research about the impact of innovation in instruction, plus recognition and reward for those faculty who would like to pursue innovation in their instructional activities and scholarship.

Kenneth C. Green • Digital Tweed / Inside Higher Ed • 13 July 2017

Guidelines for Machiavellian Change Agents

• Concentrate your efforts
• Pick issues carefully; know when to fight
• Know the history
• Build coalitions
• Set modest – and realistic – goals
• Leverage the value of data
• Anticipate personnel turnover
• Set deadlines for decisions
• Nothing is static – anticipate change

Source: J. Victor Baldridge, Rules for a Machiavellian Change Agent, 1983
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Innovation and the Fear of Trying

Kenneth C. Green

Last week in Inside Higher Ed, reporter David Matthews of The Times Higher Education characterized “as a surprising conclusion” the work of Carnegie Mellon University anthropologist Lauren Herckis that a major barrier to instructional innovation and technology utilization in higher education is that faculty “are simply too afraid of looking stupid in front of their students to try something new.”

Alas, this is not new news. Nor is it a surprising conclusion. The fear of trying among faculty, because of the fear of looking awkward, foolish, or incompetent in front of their students, dates back to the arrival of the first microcomputers (aka IBM PCs and Macs) in college classrooms and campus computer labs in the mid-1980s.

Let us review the reasons why the fear of trying is neither new nor surprising.

More than three decades ago the core technology skills we now view as essential and today we hope are ubiquitous among students and faculty typically were not. Typing, transformed as keyboarding, emerged as a critical skill. In the early-1980s, I attended an interesting presentation on the future of office automation. The speaker, a technology expert from Rand Corp., explained the semantic imperative for talking about keyboarding: typing was a (low status) secretarial skill, while keyboarding implied a higher status skill tied to computers. The semantic rebranding of typing as keyboarding, the Rand expert explained, would make learning keyboarding (aka typing) more acceptable to mid- and high-level managers and professionals.

Concurrent with keyboarding was, of course, learning to use and master key computer applications such as word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software. Understandably this was a time-intensive and often frustrating task for many mid-career faculty some 25-35 years ago, despite the best efforts of their institutions to provide faculty only training programs and one-on-one instruction (alas, often provided by tech-savvy undergraduates).

But even as faculty began to acquire these core tech skills, other fear of trying factors emerged. For example, by the early/mid-1990s, I began hearing reports of what I would come to characterize as a new form of “Oedipal aggression in the classroom.” Beyond mocking professors for their academic demeanor or attire, students could now chastise faculty for their discomfort with technology:

- One dimension of the tech discomfort was when faculty would have to type (or rather, keyboard!) in front of their students. When fumbling keyboarding efforts were projected onto a classroom screen, faculty often confronted the stage whispered comment that “Oh look! Professor Jones can't type.”
- Internet access to primarily sources – including faculty authors at other institutions – emerged as the second dimension of public professorial discomfort. If Prof. Jones was not available to discuss an assigned reading, students could easily email their questions directly to Prof Wilson, author of the assigned article. And, in turn, Prof. Wilson might respond with more than just answers, perhaps asking to see the syllabus that included his or her work.
- A third dimension of the public professorial discomfort emerged as classrooms went wireless, enabling students to easily fact check faculty in real time: “Prof. Green: your data are interesting, but dated. I’m looking at the most recent numbers from the same source you used, and things have changed a bit.”

Beyond the public potential for embarrassment, one continuing factor in the conversation about innovation and the fear of trying has been the absence of compelling evidence that a new technology or innovative instructional technique really does make a difference in
student learning and outcomes. **Four decades** into the much discussed (and hyped!) “IT revolution” in higher education, a good portion of the campus conversation about innovation and technology remains driven by opinion and epiphany, rather than hard evidence documenting impacts and outcomes. Consequently, it is not surprising that many faculty would understandably be ambivalent about “attempting to innovate” in their instructional activities if there is no evidence that “innovation” affects student learning and outcomes.

Finally, there is the continuing absence of collegial, departmental, and institutional recognition and reward for innovation that affects the **fear of trying**. Data from The Campus Computing Project confirm that the vast majority of the two-and four-year American colleges and universities have not expanded the algorithm for review and promotion to include faculty efforts at instructional innovation and technology. So despite the public proclamations of presidents and provosts about the “key role of innovative information technology resources here at Acme College,” review and promotion decisions reside in the hands of departmental colleagues and chairs who have largely been unwilling adopt an expanded notion of scholarship for their (often younger) colleagues who would like to pursue innovation in their instructional activities.

If trustees, presidents, provosts, deans, and department chairs really want to address the **fear of trying** and foster innovation in instruction, then they have to recognize that **infrastructure fosters innovation**. And infrastructure, in the context of technology and instruction, involves more than just computer hardware, software, digital projectors in classrooms, learning management systems, and campus web sites. The technology is actually the easy part. The real challenges involve a commitment to research about the impact of innovation in instruction, plus recognition and reward for those faculty who would like to pursue innovation in their instructional activities and scholarship.

Kenneth C. Green, the Digital Tweed blogger at INSIDE HIGHER ED, is the founding director of The Campus Computing Project, the largest continuing study of the role of computing, elearning, and information technology in American higher education.
The Babel Problem with Big Data in Higher Ed

Kenneth C. Green

Over the past decade Bring Data! has emerged as a new cri
de coeur across American colleges and universities.
Campus planning initiatives, policy discussions about
student success (retention, advising, institutional outcomes,
and value added), instructional interventions and innovations,
operational effectiveness, and efforts to enhance the return on
investment (ROI) are all data dependent. And because “Big
Data” has emerged as a powerful engine of analysis and insight
in the consumer and corporate sectors, it is no surprise that
institutional leaders (along with patrons on campus boards and
in state legislatures) have great expectations for the role of Big
Data and Analytics across all sectors of American higher
education.

We can trace the origins of this movement, in part, to
Margaret Spellings, currently president of the University of
North Carolina System. As Secretary of Education under
George W. Bush from 2005-2009, Secretary Spellings frequently
cited the “Deming Dictum” – In God we trust; all others bring
data – as a charming if disarming way to articulate the both the
K-12 and higher education policy priorities of the Bush
Administration. And in her current position as the leader of the
University of North Carolina System of Higher Education,
President Spellings has also served notice about her “bring data”
priorities for planning, policy, and decision-making across for
the 17-campus UNC system.

Yet great expectations (and great needs) notwithstanding,
bringing Big Data and Analytics into the operational DNA of
American higher education, might be appropriately
characterized as a Sisyphean task. Why?
First, presidential and provost proclamations supporting
data-informed campus decision-making notwithstanding, much
of the decision-making in higher education is too often
“informed” by opinion and epiphany, not data and
evidence. Recent national surveys of presidents, provosts,
CFOs, and CIOs reveal that the many (and in some surveys the
majority) do not believe that their institutions do a good job of
using data to inform campus planning and decision-making.

Second, to paraphrase a long ago New Yorker cartoon,
higher education has lots of information technology, but too
many colleges and universities seem to have little timely and
useful data and information to aid and inform campus planning
and decision-making.

Third, both CIOs and CAOs seem to agree that, in general,
their institutional investments in data and analytics have not
been “very effective.” The data about the effectiveness of
institutional investments come from the fall 2017 ACAO Survey
of CAOs and the 2016 Campus Computing Survey.

Fourth, the “data culture” at too many institutions
continues to use as a data weapon (what you did wrong; how
your unit failed) and not as a resource (how do we use data to
do better).

Finally, the core task of data integration and transparency
remain a major challenge. Big data analytics depend on a rich
“gumbo” of data from a wide array of campus sources, often
generated by several different technology platforms and data
bases. As a technology rather than a campus culture issue, data
integration and transparency – creating the “data gumbo” –
should, in theory, be the easiest of these factors to resolve in a
timely matter. In fact, it may be among the most difficult.

The different, and often disparately structured and defined
data from Student Information Systems (SIS), campus financial
systems, student financial aid systems, HR/personnel files,
ePortfolios, Learning Management Systems (LMS),
alumni/development programs, and other databases large and
small that are scattered across campuses (and servers and now
also the Cloud) are the core resources that inform and fuel
program assessments, institutional interventions, and
outcomes analysis. The business intelligence and data mining
tools that, a more decade ago, allowed Wal-Mart to discover a
surprising run on beer in its Florida stores ahead of Hurricane
Frances in 2004 are the same tools that colleges and
universities now want deploy to gain information and insight
about how to improve student success efforts, and how to
assess the impact of campus programs and the efficiency of
campus operations.

These same data resources and tools are essential for
campus efforts to respond to the mandates – some new and
some ignored for years but now enforced – from accrediting
associations, government regulators, and various higher ed
sponsors that increasing demand hard data and real evidence
to document claims for program effectiveness and institutional
outcomes.

Framing the Data Babel Problem

Over the past four decades higher education’s technology providers have repeatedly promised data integration and transparency.

Consider the hypothetical case of Susan Wilson, the provost at Acme State University, a mid-sized public comprehensive institution of some 14,000 students. Susan Wilson began her academic career as a newly-hired assistant professor at Acme State in 1985, as campuses across the US were grappling with strategies to address enrollment problems created by the demographic downturn caused by the declining size of the high school graduating cohort in her state and across the US.

- In 1993, as a member of a Faculty Oversight Committee on Enrollment and Retention, Assistant Professor Wilson heard the directors of university’s Administrative Computing and Institutional Research units cite the benefits Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) as way to integrate data from various campus sources which would facilitate analytic efforts to enhance lagging recruitment and retention activities.

- A decade later, as an Associate Professor and Associate Dean, Prof. Wilson sat through technical explanations about the importance of Web Services and the emergence of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) as a new strategy that would generate more and (much) better data, information, and analysis about academic programs and institutional operations for her and her Acme State colleagues.

- And following her appointment as Provost in 2015, Susan Wilson now feels she has been captive to way too many presentations about data and analytics from both campus personnel and technology providers. These presentations, including those from “analytic specialists” with barely five years of experience in the higher education market, typically extoll the potential of Big Data and Cloud Services to generate insight and analysis about academic programs and institutional operations for her and her Acme State colleagues.

- And following her appointment as Provost in 2015, Susan Wilson now feels she has been captive to way too many presentations about data and analytics from both campus personnel and technology providers. These presentations, including those from “analytic specialists” with barely five years of experience in the higher education market, typically extoll the potential of Big Data and Cloud Services to generate insight and analysis about academic programs and institutional operations for her and her Acme State colleagues.

Despite the recurring promises during her rise through the ranks over her decades at Acme State, Provost Wilson does not believe that any of these “new technologies” have truly delivered on oft-offered (and much needed) data transparency, data integration, and now, Big Data Analytics. Admittedly, she knows that the Student Success movement may have added more elements to the data gumbo; however, she also knows that the underlying challenges of integrating the key data elements remain significant. Consequently, Susan Wilson, like many of her CAO colleagues, remains understandably skeptical that future investments in analytics will provide the much-needed data, information, and insight for Acme State.

Data Transparency and Integration

Data transparency and integration issues might be characterized, in part, as a “cross-platform integration challenge.” Critical data come from a variety of sources and technology applications or platforms and then have to be coded or processed in a way that allows links to individual student records ahead of analysis.

This involves more than simply linking student data via a common ID number in several data files. Data structures, common data definitions, and other issues typically pose significant challenges that require time and money (and often outside expertise) to resolve linking and data integration problems.

The analytical potential for the data linkage and “data gumbo” is a gestalt where the “sum” (information and insight) from the analytical work should be more than the “parts” were the work is limited to just one or two sets of data from different sources (e.g., background and transcript data from a Student Information System and transactional data from a Learning Management System).

Unfortunately, rather having access to a “data gumbo” rich with integrated data sources, most colleges and universities continue to experience “data babel” – critical operational challenges that involve applications, platforms, and data bases (often six to eight or more on some campuses) that do not “talk” with one another and that are difficult to aggregate, integrate, analyze, and exploit.

Admittedly, cross platform issues (challenges) are common to higher education. And yet some cross-platform strategies and solutions do work. For example, the emergence of the LTI standards for learning management systems reflects efforts to provide common standards across various LMS applications. The relatively fast and widespread adoption of the LTI standard among higher ed’s LMS providers provides a model for how tech providers might collaborate on standards that would facilitate data integration and cross-platform data migration.

From Watching to Doing

Some institutions have solved the “data babel” problem. Arizona State and Georgia State, among others, have each earned accolades and have become the envy of many of peers for their work with data and analytics in service to student learning and student success. Georgia State University reports its impressive gains in retention and graduation are fueled, in part by analytic work that monitors some 800 student risk factors, and also by a significant investment in support services. But ASU and Georgia State are analytic outliers in the landscape of American colleges and universities.

So rather than continuing to talk about what Arizona State and Georgia State have done with Big Data, the key question pressing most institutions is how can they do what Arizona State and Georgia State have done – faster, easier, and at lower cost?

One component of the solution involves identifying the operational and structural barriers that impede efforts to integrate data across the key applications and platforms. Addressing the structural barriers will require that the various platform providers – ok, the harsher term is vendors – learn to
play nice with one another and their campus clients when it comes to data access and integration. Simply “sending data streams to the Cloud” – the strategy I’ve heard in several presentations in recent years, will not solve the data compatibility and integration challenge presented by data streams from multiple platforms.

A second key component involves strategies to optimize the use of student data in digital learning, leveraging the data stream from adaptive courseware and other resources to improve prospects for course completion before course correction is no longer possible. Efforts to leverage digital learning resources and strategies must include operational strategies that exploit data, provide information and insight, and launch interventions faster and better to improve the likelihood that more students succeed.

A third component of the solution must focus on faculty. Data-laden PowerPoint presentations and research papers typically lack the compelling narrative required to engage faculty – to help explain to faculty how analytic insights and the interventions that emerge from Big Data analytics can help their students. Compelling evidence of impact, coupled with a change of the too-common campus culture of using data as a weapon to using data as a resource are essential if campus officials hope to build faculty trust and foster faculty engagement in student success initiatives.

Ultimately, it’s time for institutional leadership and technology providers to stop talking about the benefits of Big Data and start working on ways to resolve the data babel and related issues that impede institutional efforts to exploit data to enhance our understanding of student learning, to help target interventions intended to increase retention and degree completion, and to inform decision-making about campus management and administration.

Acknowledgement: My thanks to Karen Vignare, director of the Personalized Learning Consortium at the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, and James Ptaszynski, Vice President for Digital Learning at the University of North Carolina System Office, for their very thoughtful comments on an early draft of this blog post.

Kenneth C. Green, the Digital Tweed blogger at INSIDE HIGHER ED, is the founding director of The Campus Computing Project, the largest continuing study of the role of computing, eLearning, and information technology in American higher education.
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Beginning the Fourth Decade of the “IT Revolution” in Higher Education

Plus Ça Change

Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose.
(“The more things change, the more things stay the same.”)

By Kenneth C. Green

January 24, 1984, will be remembered in the technology world and elsewhere as the day that Apple launched the Macintosh computer. In the crowded Flint Center at De Anza College, a community college across the street from the Apple campus in Cupertino, California, Steve Jobs pulled a beige computer out of a gray travel bag and formally introduced the Mac to the world.¹
Less known or remembered about the day is that concurrent with the Macintosh launch at De Anza College, undergraduates at Drexel University in Philadelphia were the first college students anywhere in the world to see the Mac up close and personal. In the run-up to the 1984 Macintosh launch, Apple negotiated agreements with some two dozen, primarily private, Ivy League or other highly selective colleges and universities to sell Macs to college students for $1,000 (well below the retail price of $2,495). Drexel, then viewed by many as a blue-collar engineering school that lived in the shadow of the University of Pennsylvania, was somewhat of an outlier in the group of largely elite institutions that made up the Apple University Consortium (AUC). Yet Drexel, under the technology leadership of Brian Hawkins (who would become the founding president of EDUCAUSE fourteen years later), was the first college or university to sign a Macintosh purchase agreement with Apple, in the spring of 1983; moreover, the Drexel agreement, unlike most of the other AUC contracts, provided a Mac to all first-year students. And so because Drexel made the early and significant commitment to Apple, Drexel students were the first in the nation to get Macs through campus-purchase programs. 

Given the current ubiquity of technology on college and university campuses and in the consumer market, it can be difficult to understand the excitement and impact of the first generation of personal computers—IBM PCs and Apple Macs—some thirty years ago. The arrival of these devices on campuses was the catalyst for what, in 1986, EDUCOM Vice President Steve Gilbert and I called the "new computing" in higher education: "Thousands of faculty members and administrators have decided that 1986 is the year that they will have a personal relationship with computing…. Most academics now getting started on computing are professionals who haven't been computer users before and who will never think of themselves as computer experts. What they realize is that they are embarking on a journey they can no longer delay."²

**Great Expectations**

That technology journey—our technology journey—has taken all of us many places over the past three decades. The journey has been fueled, in part, by great expectations for the use of new technologies in education—expectations that were articulated well before the first PCs and Macs even arrived on college and university campuses. For example, in a 1913 newspaper interview, the prolific inventor Thomas Edison proclaimed: “Books will soon be obsolete in the public schools. Scholars will be instructed through the eye. It is possible to teach every branch of human knowledge with the motion picture. Our school system will be completely changed in ten years.”³

A half century later, in a 1966 *Scientific American* article, Stanford Professor Patrick Suppes observed: “Both the processing and the uses of information are undergoing an unprecedented technological revolution.” Anticipating that technology could bring great benefits to education, Suppes added: “One can predict that in a few more years millions of schoolchildren will have access to what Philip of Macedon's son Alexander enjoyed as a royal prerogative: the personal services of a tutor as well-informed and responsive as Aristotle.”⁴

Note that Edison's 1913 prediction for the demise of books in public schools was offered eleven years before sound came to motion pictures. Suppes's 1966 prediction of the digital Aristotle was published just a year after IBM released the game-changing IBM 360 mainframe computer and about a decade before the arrival of the Apple II computer. Edison did not secure his fame or fortune by providing motion pictures that would supplant textbooks in public schools. Suppes, however, went on to co-found the Computer Curriculum Corporation in 1967, one of the first companies to create instructional software for education.

A more sobering view of the challenges involved in deploying technology resources in education was put forth in 1972 by George W. Bonham, founding editor of *Change* magazine, an influential publication in higher education:

For better or worse, television today dominates much of American life and manners…. Part of [the] lackluster record of the educational uses of television is of course due to the heretofore merciless economies of the medium. But fundamental pedagogic mistrust of the medium remains also a fact of life. The proof of the pudding lies in the fact that on many campuses today fancy television equipment… now lies idle and often unused…. Academic indifference to this enormously powerful medium becomes doubly incomprehensible when one remembers that the present college generation is also the first television generation.⁵

Substitute the word *technology* for *television*, and Bonham's assessment speaks volumes about similar challenges inherent in current efforts with information technology: the high costs of creating useful and effective instructional content, pedagogic distrust (or, at a minimum, ambivalence) about the impact and benefits of instructional content and technologies, and expensive equipment
Campus leaders’ perspectives on the impact and effectiveness of the institutional investment in information technology are reflected in three roughly concurrent surveys that I conducted from December 2011 to September 2012. The three groups of survey participants—presidents, chief academic officers, and chief information officers (CIOs) across all sectors of higher education—were asked to assess eight separate areas of technology investment: academic support services; alumni services; on-campus instruction; libraries; management and operations; research and scholarship; and student services. For the purposes of this discussion, it is useful to look at the responses of presidents, provosts, and CIOs on the “big four” issues: on-campus instruction; online instruction; management and operations; and analytics.

As shown in figure 1, less than half (and often just 40 percent) of presidents and provosts assessed campus IT investments to be “very effective” (a 6 or 7). CIO assessments were slightly different from those of presidents and provosts, but not by much—except for the over 60 percent of CIOs who assessed the institutional investment in “administrative information systems and operations” as “very effective.”

By 2014, the percentage of CIOs reporting “very effective” on these same four metrics improved slightly (see figure 2); comparable data for presidents and provosts is not available.

Unfortunately, the data provides clear evidence that the great expectations for technology to aid and improve instruction, operations, and data analysis have fallen short. Over the years, both technology providers and campus technology advocates/evangelists may have contributed to unrealistic expectations about how quickly an investment in information technology could deliver expected gains in instructional outcomes or institutional performance and productivity. A key responsibility of and challenge for IT leaders is to manage expectations and to communicate the effectiveness of IT investments. We can—and must—do better.

Plus Ça Change

The technologies that are pervasive and ubiquitous both on and off campus today have changed dramatically since the arrival
of the first PCs and Macs in the mid-1980s. Without question, we have witnessed amazing technological change (the more things change) over the past three decades: hardware, software, the Internet, wireless networks that foster mobility, digital content, social media, and “big data” analytics. However, at least in the higher education arena, this change has been bounded by continuing challenges that often impede efforts to leverage and effectively exploit the full value of technology investments (the more they stay the same). These challenges largely involve the enabling infrastructure: integrating technology into instruction; improving productivity; furthering online education; recognizing and rewarding faculty who “do IT” in instruction; using data to aid and inform decision making; and managing expectations about information technology.

In many ways, colleges and universities now lag behind where they once led. Consumer markets and corporations move and adopt more quickly. Consequently, higher education’s concurrent delay in implementation and effective exploitation of many common consumer- and corporate-sector technologies causes many students, faculty, administrators, board members, and other observers to ask: “Why can I do these things off campus but not on campus?”

Three decades into the much-discussed and often overhyped technology revolution in higher education, it is increasingly clear that the major technology challenges confronting higher education are not about technology per se (i.e., the things we buy). Rather, as EDUCAUSE publications have often noted, the challenges involve how we deploy various technologies effectively (the things we do with technology). And I would argue that perhaps most important, these challenges are about (the things we do with technology).

### Technology Priorities

We should not be surprised that the biggest technology challenges focus on continuing efforts with the instructional integration of IT resources. That’s the clear message that emerges from more than a decade of data about IT priorities from the annual Campus Computing Survey of CIOs and senior campus officials. For example, in the fall of 2014, 81 percent of the CIOs and senior IT officers participating in the survey identified the instructional integration of IT resources as a “very important” campus IT priority over the next two to three years (see figure 3), followed by “hiring/retaining qualified IT staff” (76 percent), “providing adequate user support” and “leveraging IT for student success” (both at 74 percent), and “IT security” (69 percent). And although the fall 2014 numbers for top IT priorities vary slightly by sector (e.g., research universities vs. community colleges), there is great consistency about the top three items across sectors: instruction, staffing, and user support.

![FIGURE 3. Campus IT Priorities, Fall 2014](chart.png)

Source: Kenneth C. Green, Campus Computing Survey, 2014

### Table 1. Campuses with a Formal Program to Assess the Impact of Information Technology on Instruction and Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Institutions</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Research Universities</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Research Universities</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>-23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public BA/MA Institutions</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private BA/MA Institutions</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kenneth C. Green, Campus Computing Survey (selected years)
Unfortunately, most institutions over the past decade or so have not invested in formal efforts to assess the impact of technology in instruction and learning; moreover, whereas some sectors have experienced modest gains, the numbers have declined between 2002 and 2014 for public research and private research universities (see table 1) and generally remain lower overall: under 30 percent across all sectors in the fall of 2014. Without a commitment to evaluating investments in innovation, we can’t know what works.

The Productivity Conundrum

Recent reports suggesting that productivity in the United States has declined should be a catalyst for the continuing conversation about productivity and technology in higher education. Some productivity experts argue that the productivity-enhancing impacts of new technologies (e.g., iPhones, social media) are less than the productivity gains that followed the emergence of the personal computer and the Internet three decades ago. And then there is the May 2015 assessment by Paul Krugman, a Princeton University economics professor and Nobel laureate: “The whole digital area, spanning more than four decades, is looking like a disappointment. New technologies have yielded great headlines, but modest economic results.” Krugman added: “New technology is supposed to serve businesses as well as consumers, and should be boosting the production of traditional as well as new goods [and services]. The big productivity gains of the period from 1995 to 2005 came largely in things like inventory control, and showed up as much or more in non-technology businesses like retail as in high-technology industries themselves. Nothing like that is happening now.”

“Great headlines, but modest results” (to paraphrase Krugman) might also be an appropriate characterization of technology and productivity in higher education. Admittedly, economists have a precise definition for productivity and specific metrics for measuring productivity. However, you’ll need more than a good economics textbook to secure consensus on the meaning of “academic productivity” among faculty and administrators, with the latter recognizing the need to improve “academic productivity” as a way to reduce (or at least contain) the rising cost of higher education.

Indeed, much as we struggle with the meaning and attributes of quality in higher education, so too do we struggle with the meaning and attributes of productivity, particularly in the context of campus investments in and expenses for technology in research, instruction, operations and management, and support services. Yet there is an implied expectation that IT investments in higher education should result in improved productivity. The questions then become: How would we know? What should we measure?

Yes, we can probably measure productivity in the research domain, and it is likely significant. Simulations and analysis that once consumed huge computer resources for computation and storage and that previously required significant (and expensive) mainframe time are now routinely run, often quickly,
on notebook, desktop, and lower-cost supercomputers.

It is in the other domains—instruction, operations and management, and support services—that the conversation about information technology and productivity becomes problematic. To be sure, many of higher education’s IT investments over the past three decades have made improvements in these domains. The Internet has brought rich digital content to students and faculty across all sectors, segments, and disciplines. Online registration and fee payment have saved countless students countless hours previously spent standing in long registration and payment lines at the beginning of each term. Analytic systems now automatically pour data into dashboards as part of the effort to aid and inform decision making. Monitoring systems send automatic e-mails to students and faculty when they detect signs that students may be falling behind in coursework. But in many ways, these examples reside at the margin, not the core, of the productivity conundrum. Despite these gains, higher education costs have not declined. The understanding that technology will enhance productivity and consequently reduce costs has not played out in most sectors of American higher education.

Although campus IT budgets may ebb and flow somewhat during good and bad economic times, institutions continue to spend significant sums on information technology—about 5 to 6 percent of the total institutional operating budget—for instruction, operations and management, and support services. Yet few would argue that individual institutions, as well as higher education as an “industry” are now more productive because of IT expenditures and investments.

MOOCs and Online Education

Online enrollments have exploded over the past fifteen years. Online courses and programs would seem to be the one higher education domain that could showcase the productivity gains from technology investments.

Yet despite the big gains in online enrollments across all sectors and segments, it is not clear that “going online” has reduced costs and increased instructional or institutional productivity. Part of the problem is that colleges and universities do not do a good job of dealing with cost accounting—particularly cost accounting for instructional programs. Instructional “costs” in online programs are often taken as the direct cost of faculty time, with little acknowledgment of any of the other costs involved in developing and supporting online programs: course and content development, the use of instructional support services, the time provided by IT support staff to assistant students and faculty, and allocating the true overhead costs involved in individual online courses and programs.

The productivity pressures are reflected in the fawning endorsements for MOOCs we witnessed several years ago. Part of the attraction of MOOCs was the potential for scale—the opportunity to enroll 10,000 or 100,000 students in a single course. But completion rates are dismal (in the single digits), user support issues are significant, development costs are high, and revenues (for the institutions that seek to make money from “free” courses”) may be problematic.

Over the past two years, the response to the low-completion critique of MOOCs has involved a revisionist redefinition of “course completion” in the context of student intention. That is, course completion is calculated based on those whose intent, at the time of MOOC registration, was to complete the course, rather than just browse or audit. For example, a recent HarvardX report revealed that 22 percent of the “intend to complete” registrants across nine HarvardX courses earned a certificate. These numbers are better than the single-digit completion rates generally reported for the larger population of MOOC registrants, but something is missing here. Where is an appropriate comparison number for more “conventional” online courses or more traditional classroom-based courses? In the case of the latter courses—such as developmental math, introductory psychology, organic chemistry, or Elizabethan sonnets—almost all those who register probably “intend to complete” the course. Would the faculty, department chairs, and deans who supervise these courses be satisfied with a 22 percent or even a 35 percent completion rate? Unlike

If campus officials are truly committed to advancing the role of technology in instruction, then it is time for these leaders to stand up for and stand with the faculty who are doing this work.
TABLE 2. Campuses with a Formal Program to Recognize and Reward the Use of Information Technology as Part of the Routine Faculty Review and Promotion Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Institutions</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Research Universities</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>137.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Research Universities</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public BA/MA Institutions</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private BA/MA Institutions</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>-15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kenneth C. Green, The Campus Computing Survey (selected years)

there was a statistically significant difference in the completion rates (higher for F2F courses), both the online and F2F courses reported completion rates over 93 percent.  

The course completion numbers for non-MOOC online and F2F courses cited in these two reports are more than three to four times better than the 22 percent completion rate reported for the HarvardX students “who intend” to complete MOOCS. To date, the experience with MOOCS suggests that they are one point on the continuum of online education options for students and institutions. But at present, MOOCS may at best supplement, not supplant, more conventional approaches to both online and F2F courses.

**Faculty Recognition and Reward**

Across all sectors, most colleges and universities loudly and proudly proclaim their commitment to the innovative use of technology in online and on-campus instruction. Concurrently, most institutions continue to ignore and, more often, punish faculty members who would like to have their efforts in innovative and effective uses of IT resources in instruction considered in the review and promotion process. The conventional wisdom often offered to younger faculty is “don’t do tech” until after they have earned tenure. Indeed, the issue of recognition and reward remains one of the most daunting issues facing faculty of all ranks—but especially junior (tenure-track) faculty—as they build their scholarly portfolios.

Data from the fall 2014 Campus Computing Survey reveals that on average, two-fifths of institutions support instructional innovation with grants to help faculty redesign courses or create simulations, ranging from 26.9 percent in private BA/MA institutions to 56.9 percent in public research universities. Yet too few institutions have expanded the algorithm for faculty review and promotion to include technology. Consider, for example, the trend data on “review and promotion” from the annual Campus Computing Survey. The good news is that in many sectors, the proportion of institutions that have expanded the faculty review and promotion criteria to include technology has increased dramatically. The exceptions are private research universities and private BA/MA institutions, where the numbers remain largely the same as they were in 1997. But even with the gains, the numbers in all sectors are still very low: less than 25 percent in the fall of 2014 (see table 2).

The survey data cited above provides clear evidence that despite the proclamations of presidents, provosts, and
board chairs about how their institutions have made significant investments to leverage information technology for instruction, the operational decisions about tenure and promotion depend on the decisions of senior faculty and department chairs—and on whether these departmental leaders will recognize and support the technology efforts and activity of faculty into and through the review and promotion process.

If campus officials—including IT leaders—are truly committed to advancing the role of technology in instruction, then it is time for these leaders to stand up for and stand with the faculty who are doing this work, affirming the value of technology for those who wish to affirm it as part of their scholarly portfolio.

**The Data Challenge**

The third “A” in the accessibility, affordability, and accountability mandates of *A Test of Leadership* (the 2006 Spelling Commission report) was a clear directive to higher education and to college and university leaders to *bring data* to address the “remarkable shortage of clear, accessible information about crucial aspects of American colleges and universities.”

As I wrote in *EDUCAUSE Review* at the time: “The issue before [the higher education IT community] in the wake of the Spellings Commission report concerns when college and university IT leaders will assume an active role, a *leadership* role, in these discussions, bringing their IT resources and expertise—*bringing data, information, and insight*—to the critical planning and policy discussions about institutional assessment and outcomes that affect all sectors of U.S. higher education.”

Admittedly, we have made some important gains in the data domain. Technology providers have improved the range of the analytic resources they now offer campus clients. Colleges and universities are beginning to leverage real-time student data from the learning management systems and other sources to send warning notices to both faculty and students regarding course progress. On a broader scale, the EDUCAUSE Core Data Service (CDS), launched by former EDUCAUSE President Brian Hawkins in 2002, provides benchmarking data on various IT metrics. Whereas the Campus Computing Project focuses primarily on IT planning and policy issues, the CDS provides detailed institutional data on IT financials, staffing, and services.

Yet in 2011, less than two-fifths of presidents, provosts, and chief financial officers ranked their institutions’ use of data to aid and inform decisions as “very effective” (see figure 4). In 2012, only 22.7 percent of CIOs, 37.7 percent of provosts, and 39 percent of presidents rated their institutional investment in analytics as “very effective” (see figure 1). By 2014, just 30 percent of CIOs rated investment in analytics at their institutions as “very effective” (see figure 2).

Finally, in the effort to make better use of data for decision making, we also have to address the *data culture* in higher education. Too often, data is used as a *weapon* (What was done wrong?) as opposed to a *resource* (How can we do better? What’s the path to doing better?). The model here should be continuous quality improvement: using data to aid and inform decision making and to help improve programs, resources, and services.

**FIGURE 4. Using Data to Aid and Inform Campus Decision Making, 2011**

Percentage reporting “very effective” (6/7).

Scale: 1 = not effective; 7 = very effective.

Priorities: What We Must Do Better

For the past several decades (and particularly over the past ten years), there has been much talk about the need for change in higher education. Concurrently, there has been much talk about technology as a catalyst for change. Yet as noted above, the key technology challenges that confront higher education are not about technology per se; rather, they are about our efforts to make effective use of technology resources, and they are about the people, planning, program, policy, and budget issues that often impede these efforts.

As we look ahead to the fourth decade of the technology revolution in higher education, campus and IT leaders must focus on the enabling infrastructure that will allow (a) students of all ages and backgrounds to realize their educational aspirations; (b) faculty across all disciplines and sectors to realize their instructional aspirations and scholarly goals; and (c) institutions across all sectors to do a better job of exploiting the power and potential of technology resources to enhance instruction, operations and management, and support services.

Accordingly, as we look beyond bits and bytes, beyond hardware and software, beyond network speeds and feeds, and beyond the ebb and flow of IT budgets in good times and difficult times, the priorities for information technology in higher education for the next decade are clear:

- **User Support.** Colleges and universities across all sectors must commit to major improvements in user training and support, including support for faculty who want to do more with IT resources in their instructional activities.

- **Assessment.** Opinion and epiphany cannot be allowed to dominate the conversations about institutional IT policy and planning. If colleges and universities are going to invest in technology to support instruction, they also need to assess the impact of these continuing efforts and investments in teaching, learning, and educational outcomes.

- **Productivity.** Much as higher education has struggled with the conversation about quality, so too will academe continue to struggle with a candid discussion about productivity. It is now time for academic leaders, including higher education’s IT leadership, to have frank, candid, and public conversations about productivity: What are the appropriate metrics? What are reasonable expectations? What might technology contribute? And what are the limits of information technology in the discussion about productivity?

- **Online Education.** The large numbers of students enrolled in online courses and the growing number of institutions that offer online programs speak to both student interest and institutional aspirations and opportunities. The data on the educational outcomes of (non-MOOC) online courses and programs remains mixed. To do better, institutions must commit to significant and sustained efforts to evaluate their online efforts, documenting what works and what needs to improve. Concurrently, we need a new candor about the true costs of developing online programs, which includes full cost accounting for the people and the institutional resources required to support online programs and online students.

- **Recognition and Reward.** We must move to an expansive definition of scholarship in order to value the efforts of faculty who commit to making technology and experiments with IT resources part of their instructional portfolios. It is time for the deans, department chairs, and senior faculty who populate review and promotion committees to stand up for and stand with their colleagues who are innovating with technology.

- **Data as a Resource.** Higher education institutions must stop using data as a weapon against students, faculty,
and programs. Rather, they should commit to using data as a resource that provides information and insight about the need for change and the path toward that change.

The Value of Information Technology. In general, IT leaders have not done a good job of communicating the value of information technology to campus audiences. Moreover, institutional leaders must do a better job of conveying the value and impact of higher education’s investments in information technology to off-campus audiences: board members, project sponsors, patrons, alumni, and government officials.

Higher education has invested significant time and money in information technology over the past three decades. And admittedly, academe has experienced some significant benefits in the areas of content and services. However, our reach continues to exceed our grasp, our aspirations continue to fall short of our implementations, and the corporate and consumer experience continues to cast a shadow over campus efforts. A renewed commitment to an enabling infrastructure, as part of our ongoing investment in IT resources, will help to ensure that the more things change, the less they will stay the same.

Notes
7. The top Campus Computing Survey priorities align with the number 1 and number 2 IT issues in the annual EDUCAUSE list for 2014: (1) Hiring and retaining qualified staff, and updating the knowledge and skills of existing technology staff; (2) Optimizing the use of technology in teaching and learning in collaboration with academic leadership, including understanding the appropriate level of technology to use.
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