

Participants in 2013 Worldviews Conference debate MOOCs and higher education ‘disruption’

Report prepared by:
Richard Wellen

The second international Worldviews conference on “Global trends in media and higher education” was held in Toronto from June 19 to 21. The event was jointly organized by the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) and The Ontario Institute for Studies in Higher Education (OISE) in conjunction with two well known publications, *Inside Higher Ed* and *University World News*. Invited participants included scholars, higher education administrators, journalists, ‘ed-tech’ entrepreneurs, student activists and others.

Panels addressed topics such as university rankings, the role of media in covering higher education, and the public function and profile of universities. But one theme that seemed to dominate much of the discussion was that of Massive Open Online Courses , or MOOCs which provoked debate about the possible connection between the growing use of educational technology and academic outsourcing, “crowdsourcing” and privatization in universities. Given the recent promotion and hype surrounding MOOCs and online education, and their potential role in higher education reform, I will confine my summary and comments to themes related to this topic.

The first keynote address was given by Chad Gaffield, the president of SSHRC. Dr. Gaffield argued that the continued growth of post-secondary education would likely be accompanied by pressures for higher education institutions (HEI’s) to become more diverse, collaborative, socially engaged, networked, complex and creative. One strand in this development would be the increased deployment of digital technology in teaching and knowledge dissemination. Gaffield predicted continuing expansion of public/private partnerships, and he mentioned that one manifestation of this would be the outsourcing of teaching using online transmission and delivery of content. He connected this to broader transformations in the role of authors, editors , students and publishers in a peer-to-peer world of scholarship and research information. Gaffield – and other speakers - referred several times to “crowdsourcing,” suggesting that, to an increasing degree, academic content and practices are being created, vetted, and used in ways that no longer come under the control of the ivory tower. According to his portrait – and those of other speakers such as Glen Jones and Philip Altbach, we are seeing a disruption in the role, status and autonomy of traditional HEIs which may challenge and broaden our models of teaching and research.

The theme of technology-induced disruption and decentering was picked up by many participants. Author and Internet entrepreneur Andrew Keen spoke in dystopian terms about how the Internet-era trend of ‘disrupting’ gatekeepers was really a way of providing legitimacy to technologies that increase inequality and widen the gap between elite universities and the rest of the higher education sector. This ‘disappearing middle’ has been a major concern in connection with MOOCs, which make available free teaching content and lectures originating from freelancing ‘star’ professors at elite schools. The courses are intended, in turn, to be taken by freelancing students – or non-traditional learners - many of whom are not formally enrolled but

may hope to purchase third party assessment services that can help them eventually obtain recognized credentials at a cheap price.

Many participants recognized that the MOOC phenomenon is paradoxical. On the one hand, MOOCs are part of an open content movement in academia (along with open access scholarship) which evokes a kind of democratization of knowledge. On the other hand, in order to generate revenue from free content the ed-tech companies that provide MOOCs, need to be able to sell secondary services or monetize the student data that the on-line platform generates. In some cases this data is made available to employers for recruiting purposes and other private providers seeking to create partnerships in the higher education sphere. Many participants at the conference voiced the commonly-heard worry that the provision of free content is really a precursor to outsourcing, where cheap, portable content will replace (or deprofessionalize) at least some of the work of faculty and other academic staff. If MOOCs were to become mainstream many predict that there would be a further increase in the proportion of teaching-only faculty and HEIs.

While some participants saw the advantages of networked and flexible access to knowledge others saw MOOCs as part of a strategy of academic disaggregation that favours market forces over academic autonomy in determining curriculum and defining academic quality and priorities. Keynote speaker Sir John Daniels from the Open University in the UK expressed concern about the fact that the current MOOCs (in their Silicon Valley incarnations) are not truly 'open' and reusable. Instead MOOCs from companies such as Udacity and Coursera use restrictive licenses which place limits of price and permission on those users and institutions that want to blend them into credit bearing courses or programs. But he was nevertheless a strong advocate of online education. In fact, he strongly supported policies and programs that would promote "DIY" degrees that could be designed by students assembling portable courses from a wide variety of sources. Daniels came close to portraying the university of the future as a clearinghouse for outsourced academic services.

Indeed, Daniels and others indicated their support for the new trend of on-line 'badges' which would use crowdsourcing and online networks to validate competencies and 'prior learning' and thereby provide cheaper and more flexible alternatives to traditional university degree credits. In the U.S. influential advocates of higher education reform such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Bill Clinton are aggressively promoting MOOCs and competency based education as ways of addressing the cost inflation and the productivity 'crisis' in higher education.

By the end of the conference MOOC critics such as York graduate student and higher education blogger Melonie Fullick seemed to outnumber MOOC boosters. Many saw on-line courses as a threat to important academic values and as a means for the ed tech industry to profit from the financial challenges plaguing higher education. Notably, one of the final panels included Andrew Ng, co-founder of Coursera, the leading MOOC provider. He tried to ease concerns about MOOCs as a disruptive force by pointing to the fact that the demographic served by his company has so far included mostly non traditional students such as working people who already have degrees and people looking for intellectual stimulation for its own sake. Ng admitted, however, that in recent months Coursera has begun to directly target the traditional higher education

demographic, signing partnership deals with ten public university systems in the U.S. to provide a platform for sharing on-line curriculum.

Along the same lines, the Council of Ontario Universities has developed a consortium called Ontario Universities Online (OUO) which may be working on arrangements for universities to pool online courses. York has agreed to take part, but no discussion with faculty or Senate has yet taken place. As we have seen in the U.S. there has been significant pushback against these kinds of arrangements largely due to concerns about quality and academic autonomy.

OCUFA and its partners are to be commended for promoting an international dialogue about these trends of academic outsourcing and privatization. One lesson that members of YUFA can take away is importance of ensuring that faculty have a seat at the table when these issues are raised at York.

Report on Worldviews Conference 2013

Jana Vizmuller-Zocco, DLLL

This report has two parts: the first is a thorough description of those sessions which I attended (there were concurrent sessions: see the program in http://worldviewsconference.com/2013/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Worldviews_Agenda_June_182.pdf); the second part offers a personal reaction to the conference as a whole.

Part 1: description of sessions

- 1) 16 April 2013, 1pm-4:30pm. **Pre-conference event: “The War on Knowledge?”, Munk School of Global Affairs.**

This was a debate on the interplay between higher education, media, and society, preceded by a keynote address given by Tony Burman, Velma Rogers Graham Research Chair, Ryerson University. He underlined the fact that both higher education and traditional media are under attack (“academia is under siege just like journalism”). Furthermore, higher education’s concerns are not reported in the media, and yet, the media could be part of the solution for higher education’s concerns. He explained the manner in which the traditional media is under attack: people do not believe the truth media is reporting; continuing cutbacks and erosion of news-gathering resources; news seen as entertainment. He discussed the Arab spring and the fact that universities and media were in partnership then. He was hopeful for the future of younger journalists in their function as freelancers.

The debate which followed allowed each panel participant 3-4 minutes to offer their perspective on the topic, and answer questions posed by the moderator, Rick Salutin. These questions were: What are your frustrations? What’s the degree worth? How is the pragmatic agenda of education directing the universities’ future?

Clifford Orwin’s contribution: universities have to be different; universities are, after all, engines of economic progress; universities and their critics have to take into account broader perspectives.

Melonie Fullick’s contribution: complex issues are generally reduced to binary oppositions and therefore if a problem is framed a certain way the fix is sought a certain way, for ex., the metaphor of tsunami used by Pearson; framing of education itself as transfer of knowledge or as delivery of knowledge.

Janice Gross Stein’s contribution: she quarrelled with the title, did not like the military metaphor in the title; the fix is not ready; faculty members should defend what they do - in the media; professors must defend universities and emphasise the funding problems.

Scott Jaschik’s contribution: generally, in the media it is held that “what is new is good”, not what is “better”; hot topics in the US: 3-year college and MOOCs; it is hard to explain the life of the mind.

Questions and comments during the question period concerned the closing of the Archives of Canada and Statistics of Canada; digitization and MOOCs inherently opposed to university teaching; university must be like the Daily Show, i.e. interactive; the usefulness of knowledge for society; Tweeting as disruption or chronicle of event; university subservient to economy; unbundling of content from the people who create it.

General comment as conclusion to this session: although this pre-conference event did not specifically deal with the question in the title, and no general consensus was made regarding the siege under which universities and traditional media operate, it was a great invitation to the Worldviews Conference.

1) Friday, 19 June, 7:15pm-9:00pm. **Interview: Public trust in media, and the implications of coverage for higher education**

Speaker: Adrian Monck, Managing Director, Head of Communications and Media, World Economic Forum

Interviewer: John Fraser, Master, Massey College

This was an informal conversation between Monck and Fraser. Monk's main ideas:

1. the lack of trust in media is not an explanation for the declining and moral failure of journalism: lack of trust is due to, for ex., lay-offs. Also, research shows that most trusting readership is least educated and has least access to media; and least trusting readership has highest education and highest income.
2. There are 400 journalist-related jobs in the US but 48 000 journalism students; perhaps "Applied English" should be the journalism study program designation.
3. Unpaid internships "sucks", it is not sustainable; exceptional people break through, but it is an equity issue.
4. Trust in the media is also undermined by ownership of media products.

2) Thursday, 20 June, 8:45am-9:45am. **Keynote: Understanding People: How new insights are transforming campuses, companies and communities in the Digital Age, Chad Gaffield, President, Social Science and Humanities Research Council**

Gaffield's main ideas taking stock of the relationship between media and academia while living in a paradigm-shifting era:

1. They must learn from each other
2. They need each other to form informed public
3. Academics need to share
4. Need to learn from the past but moving far beyond: why? His premise: there is a new sense that the key distinguishing characteristic is *people*: human thought and behaviour is at the base of focus on people. Businesses are customer-focused, user experience is taken into account, partnerships are common, empowering employees. In politics, social media used by politicians; universities: student learning is focused; in health, services are patient-oriented.
5. 20th Century: model of technology transfer, linear model in which products moved from the lab to the market, one-way flow, tool makers, physical contact; 21st Century: model of innovation, push and pull processes, multidirectional flows, tool users, physical and virtual contacts.
6. Engagement while learning should go according to a T model: Broad and deep
7. Things ought to be put into a context and therefore discipline-based learning/teaching should include processes such as co-op, in-service, paid internship, collaborative research, exchange programs.
8. Challenge? How do we take advantage to enhance understanding of people in the past and present?

9. Universities should be the hub of community
10. Are measures and indicators enhancing learning?
11. Quoting Northrop Frye: the future is not pre-ordained
12. Deep conceptual changes, such as new way of thinking about diversity, i.e. not as a problem to be solved but as strength and resilience; in education: from teaching content to learning content and competencies; in research: from increasing specialization to specialization and contextualization (T model); from innovation to integrated innovation; technology engaged with people and everywhere context matters, and, above all, digital age helps us probing and understanding what we share as human beings.
13. Equilateral triangle metaphor: digital technologies – content – digital literacies
14. Knowledge mobilization is interactive; knowledge matters but how you tell the story is important
15. Challenges: who pays? Digital divide, privacy, preservation, access
16. We can do better than mass schooling.

Questions from the floor:

Q. Does the SSHRC rely on crowd-sourcing in making decisions?

A. humanities journal open to feed-back from everyone; it is moving from peer review to merit review; ½ reviewers from outside of Canada, “we are in an experimental stage”; example of limits of crowdsourcing: Wikipedia.

Q. if people are important, why do call centres say “You are important, but wait 15 minutes”, i.e. behaviour management falls back to the early 20th century? Isn’t outsourcing a cop-out from our responsibilities? Isn’t there a danger than the rhetoric overtakes what research shows?

A. Yes, rhetoric is wide-spread, but why is it that companies all of a sudden feel that that they have to appeal to you? Is that just another way for those in control to exert more control? It is a possibility, but it can be different, for ex., research is showing us how profs can be more engaging. Let’s not give in, let’s take agency.

3) 20 June, 10:00am-11:am. **Media’s better bedfellow? Coverage of research findings from higher education and think tanks**

Moderator: Joel Westheimer, Professor of Education, University of Ottawa

Panelists: Adrian Monck, Managing Director, Head of Communications and Media, World Economic Forum

David Miller, Professor of Sociology, University of Bath

Trish Hennessy, Director, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, Ontario

An informal discussion initiated by the moderator’s questions (Q), followed by 3-4 minute answers from the panelists.

Q. Think tanks slice of research = 19%, government-produced research = 29%, the vast majority of research produced by universities, but think-tank research findings represented much more in the media. It seems that advocacy-oriented research is published in the media more frequently

and gets more attention. Think tanks publish, organize conferences, sounds like universities: is there a difference?

Munk: the difference is in formation: you want to know who is paying for the knowledge; what is left out/put in, but it's about framing; his organization is funded equitably by 1000 different members; it's important to get transparencies right up front but media are looking for "sexy" stories. Vigilance must be exercised also where universities are concerned, especially if research funded by private organizations.

Miller: Think tanks are a recent phenomenon in Canada 1950-1960; most of them are conservative; historically, they were not a competitor to universities; other organizations existing, such as the transnational Trilateral commission for political and business elites to plan for the future or lobbying consultancies "front" groups set up by corporate interests; there is a rapid increase in non-university expertise; the greater question is the pull from these organizations, that's why they are not university-like. Not everything is about money: corporate funding is potentially negative but can also be constructive. Universities risk to be left out since they tend to communicate with "on the one hand, on the other hand" attitude. Universities are supposed to be different, i.e. without pressures and be partially insulated from the outside (i.e. peer review). Think tanks are not peer reviewed, they have no transparency issues (medical journals have the best policies re transparency issues). But differences between universities and think tanks are being blurred.

Hennessy: her organization is not a university and it is not a think tank (TT) but produces advocacy issues; she calls it TT as a counter to neoliberal discourse and it is funded by private individual supporters; this gives the organization independence from corporate alliance between TT and government and academics. The difference between TT and university: TT focused on how they talk about research, they know how to convey knowledge that journalists value and understand. But there is no such thing as objectivity.

Q. How do cynicism and trust play into this? There is widespread mistrust because any outlet seems to have a handle on objectivity.

Munk: Professoriate is responsible for this mistrust since they collaborate with consultants and TTs. They have to disclose things they don't say/do/etc.

Miller: there has to be an organizational / institutional disclosure about who the researcher is working for; to move to a level field to gain trust. In the UK, the whole system is mired in lack of transparency. There are questions about the direct role of money in public life, transparency regulations, need to move to a system that is more democratic. TT are on the right, the public on the left, but TTs are funded by the public.

Hennessy: that political scandals are revealed means that the system is working; there is a great role for the media to convey research findings, but if the research is fallible, they have to report it; academic work is precarious work.

Q. Rankings are not trustworthy measures; in academia it takes 2 years to get research published in specialized journals talking around to the same people; while we are doing this TT 6 month publishing time to publish their reports.

Hennessy: publishing speed depends on the goal: deep and/or faster?

Munk: his organization deals with agenda framing not agenda setting and therefore it depends on the agenda of the organization.

Miller: proper research shows what is partisan.

Hennessy: slowing down the process of research is valuable; some TTs caught in reactive research and commentary.

Q from the floor: Am I going to be respected as prof. if I engage in communicating with the public/with the media?

Hennessy: it is safe to be a public intellectual.

Munk: there is pressure on people not to step up/out since you may get bruised and battered.

Q from the floor: Is it suggested that academics do their own advocacy public relations?

Miller: the scope of private political action is expanded. Internet publishing, blogging combats inequality somewhat, does not distort structural inequality.

Munk: digital communication is important in that information in public domain allows for deeper discussion but must be done the right way. The standards are rising.

Miller: new techniques of communication are brought about in digital media: visualization etc.

4) 20 June, 11:15am-12:15. Academic freedom and freedom of the press: Old tenets, new interpretations

Moderator: Jon Western, Professor of International Relations, Mount Holyoke College
Panelists: Frank Furedi, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, University of Kent
Mark Kingwell, Professor of Philosophy, University of Toronto
Vinita Srivastava, Assistant Professor of Journalism, Ryerson University

Western: there are direct restriction concerns, such as threats against journalists in Turkey, Russia. Are there restrictions on academic faculty freedoms? Is there a place for self-censorship? What are the forms of restriction on academic journals freedom?

Furedi: freedoms are taken for granted but intellectuals have a lazy attitude towards freedom of speech. Students receive BAs without reading one book: this view meets with the criticism: why privileging the book? Why do you feel you have the right to engage in this discussion?

Academics are bad at recognizing insidious instruments that don't let us have a voice, for ex., "learning outcomes" restrict what you say and how you say it; standardized examinations stifling prof. initiative and academic judgement.

Kingwell: being a journalist is a liability at the academic level. Sessional precarious faculty can engage in public discourse but the pressure is not to. Not everyone would write in the media. Media censors itself, business drives the dumbing down, palatable package direction. This is an indirect form of censorship.

Srivastava: there is a culture of silence driven by fear from above; not fear of losing a job but of being ostracized. First you have to gain access to power and then you can speak up, especially if you are "marginalized person of color". Economic shackles make freedom of speech difficult. (mortgage, student loan)

Q from the floor: precariousness, academic freedom non existent: what is to be done? To defend labor rights, fight against inequality?

Furedi: existential security is eroded. Fight lack of freedom by engaging more and more people. Profile yourself in the media. Let's not take ourselves too seriously.

Kingwell: there is a structural irony: there is tenure but tenure creates a 2-tier social system, therefore get rid of tenure.

Srivastava: But if you get rid of tenure, does it mean people will speak up?

Q from the floor: I say things my colleagues are afraid to say, but I also self-censor, since tenure firing is possible, tenure is not safe.

Kingwell: tenure has two aspects: 1. There is governmental incursion, as no tenure is less costly, 2. Abolished by universities, which are warehouses of 18-20 year olds until they get a job. In Canada, every prof. is a public intellectual.

Western: at some level you have to compromise, trade off; in the 1060s researchers were not reporting on cannibalism for fear of losing access to research areas, academics have always done it, what's new about it?

Furedi: there are differences between compromise in self-censorship at home and censorship in institutional systems. To be offensive is a crime: censorship from within, from the individual, not from the outside, as opposed to everything in a corporation or government or military.

Kingwell: university is in ruins: rhetoric of excellence; growing gap b/n tenured and sessionals; problems with supply and demand: it is cheaper to hire sessionals; journalism's shift to digital means precariousness (start a blog and hope to be noticed).

Srivastava: But costs of tuition rising and no one is protesting: students much choose a profession.

Q from the floor: there is a new space created by social media, the ability for anyone to express their idea.

Furedi: citizenship journalism is good: blogs filter through mainstream ideas and comments. It is not investigative journalism but strong opinions on things.

Kingwell: there is potential for scepticism, since it is an illusion of participation. Twitter = blowing smoke.

Srivastava: the culture of silence (everyone is a superman under the shirt) but social media conversations break that silence: opinion and analysis but also prying; we need other people's opinion; soc media help her keep in touch with the voices that want to challenge the mainstream.

Western: the role of social media in human rights (humanitarian response), crisis management, crowd sourcing = more efficient response. A number of correspondents declining so media rely on social media.

5) 20 June, 12:45. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Storyteller Session

Moderator: Ursula Gobel, Director, Communications, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

Alfea Donato, Journalism student, Ryerson University

Daniel Browne, Journalism student, Ryerson University

This session highlighted the story teller competition (4wks to complete a compelling creative way of how research benefits society).

Alfea Donato's story:	Women's views on video surveillance
Daniel Browne's story:	Anne of Green Gables and the creation of Canada's view of itself
Project 3	Uganda's young people engaged in stories
Project 4	Leave nature as it is? The search for "while gold".

Another competition is announced for this year.

6) 20 June, 1:30. INTERVIEW: The sinking ship or the tide lifting all boats? The impact of technology on media and higher education

Speaker: Andrew Keen, Critically Acclaimed Author

Interviewer: Joel Westheimer, Professor of Education, University of Ottawa

Keene's answers to Westheimer included ideas already expressed in his books:

- We are obliterating the private sphere altogether; the public and private are merged
- The publicness of discourse is privatized but social media treat the social as private
- We are not happily alone, as in Hitchcock's *Vertigo*, where there was obsession between surveillance and voyeurism

- He issued a warning: let's not fall in love with things that do not exist
- We need to cultivate ourselves as “individuals of mystery”
- We are spending less time with ourselves thinking, creating, imagining
- There is value in transparency and openness, but also in separating and mystery
- The Internet only know how to remember
- Everyone thinks that they are doing things for the first time BUT history is repeating: Bentham before Zuckerberg
- There is a role for social media, it is connecting us (he as a writer has to be on Twitter) but it depends how we use it; Western liberals enlarge the number of users; the occupy movement epitomizes all the weaknesses of social media since we are all a part of the 99%, no tapestry for individual voices, but there was no hierarchy, no leadership, no political coherence. It did raise public consciousness
- Internet is not simply a tool, it is a lifestyle change since we think of ourselves as a spectacle, therefore the Internet has to be seen as an ideology
- It is a new prison now as dystopia, but what we are living in is like a luxury hotel

Q from the floor: technology is in the classroom, Access copyright controls what people can/cannot see.

Keene: he is against the idea that there should be free information and he fears the disappearance of the middle – the Internet decimates the middle and he fears the replacement of the human. The market will damage education.

Q form the floor: there are positive aspects of the Internet for people who want to create new knowledge.

Keene: look at what happened to newspapers: don't fall in love with the blog.

7) 20 June, 2:45-3:45. Crowd sourcing: Innovations bred by austerity

Moderator: James Bradshaw, Higher Education Reporter, Globe and Mail

Panelists: Frank Furedi, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, University of Kent
 Joe Wilson, Education Cluster, MaRS Discovery District
 Andrew Keen, Critically acclaimed author

Bradshaw intended to “keep things conversational” and asked whether we are in the era of austerity.

Furedi: the role of crowd sourcing has to be seen within the culture it is embedded in:

- the impulse to outsource authority and let others find solutions;
- it looks democratic;
- it is a public relation exercise
- organizations have consultants, crown sourcing is like consultants
- it is used in software-related industries
- it is sharing risks with large number of people
- it pretends to create a large division of labor but attempts to harness the intellectual power of few

-innovation means money, team creativity doesn't rely on lots of people
-the question of accountability of crowd sourcing.

Wilson: it is necessary to popularize the idea that the best ideas come from austerity and he gave two positive examples of crowd sourcing

-in England, Sutton Bookstore initiated peer to peer book lending system, with advantages:

- Like-minded people were meeting
- Emergent social behaviour
- Possibility to browse through other people's bookshelves

-in BC, Vermeer Retirement Home and an Elementary school: the elementary school had kids to go to the Retirement Residence one day a wk: both populations vulnerable: read slowly: adults helped kids to learn, their quality of life went up

Keen: the fact that technology space allows us to do more with less resources is a concern:

- Collapse of the state; rebellion against the state (taxes in the US, collapse of schools, hospitals)
- Rise of alternative digital business models in a decentralized open environment
- Amazon workers' job security taken away and therefore profits shift to few
- World of increasing inequality
- Open sourcing pares away at institutions
- Arendt: if institutions disappear as the go-between the state and the individual, then authoritarianism ensues
- This age is fetishizing innovation

Bradshaw: higher learning institutions proud of the fact that they don't change as quickly as other areas. Is crowd sourcing in academia?

Furedi: autonomy is a good thing but universities are not "ivory towers" any longer, since nothing important occurs at university that comes from the university, autonomy is yesterday's game; there cannot be a technological solution to human problems but technology is only a tool/means; the academic experience of youth is diminished, since they have access to what "crap".

Keen: in media and higher ed, platforms are coming on top; MOOCs from Silicon Valley, not from educators; musicians are decimated by platforms who are making money. There's crisis of authority of 20th century authoritarian meritocrats.

Wilson: how do we make sure that platforms help education?

- The meaning of "innovation" has lost its meaning
- 2013 in NA innovations in science and technology not in humanities, manufacturing
- "disruptive technologies" disrupt class, not good for everyone
- We are back in 1990s, do products affect learning? Who are the losers?

Furedi: innovation and creativity lose their meaning, above all, we don't use experimentation, i.e. open-ended journey, to see things through, a process organic to disciplines

Wilson: disruptive technologies have losers

Bradshaw: what's a brilliant lecturer?

Furedi: at age 17 he fell in love with physics after hearing a brilliant lecturer; academic lecture involves interaction, since as a lecturer you can tell when they are getting it; MOOCs train people, not educate them.

Q from the floor: 50% of profs are good lecturers; the universities held to change so long, now it's blowing up: what's the path to change? Universities that are not changing will lose.

Furedi: young people are looking for quality of education and MOOCs are a technical solution to educational problems. Changes that are occurring:

- New disciplines emerging
- In Belgium, the medieval style is re-adopted: students meet with theologians without marks.

Wilson: change is normal, but change does not go in one direction, it is an opportunity what you've got.

Q from the floor: leading institutions are not going to change; MOOCs good enough education, from anywhere – we create a separate space.

Furedi: universities have changed in the past 40 years.

8) 20 June, 4pm-5pm. **Reaching Audiences Directly: Academic Minute**

Moderator: Bill Murphy, Vice-President of Communications, University of Rochester

Panelists: Scott Jaschik, Editor, Inside Higher Ed

Kevin McCaffrey, Director Government and Community Relations, Mount Holyoke College

Katie Britton, Program Director WAMC/Northeast Public Radio

Britton: academic minute is a 2 minute 30 second segment (270 spoken words) free to all stations which want to broadcast it, so far there have been 767 segments, the radio is looking for interesting ideas to transmit; she gave an example of a prof who researched Muslim female rappers = complex identities, powerful tool, not voiceless any longer. Another ex., a researcher who researches the sex of plants.

McCaffrey: it is a collaboration between Newman's Foundation and the University of Rochester; radio -- non-profit – college collaboration; it responds to the civic responsibility of universities; higher ed is under constant pressure to communicate research and this is one way.

Jaschik: there is ambivalence in the academia communicating to the public: a prof on the Colbert Report taken negatively by university;

- TED talks given by academics get better ratings but don't get citations by academicians; it is nice for the ego to get famous; higher ed not understood, for ex., have political

scientists explained what they do? He gave some examples of politicians who do not know what humanities/social sciences are about; academic minute speaks to this “ignorance”, and also peaks to non-academics;

- Issue of speed: reasonable substance in a short time, tone is inviting, it is a shared engagement (not the less than a hundred people who read academic papers)
- It is high quality content not dumbed down
- Creates the “aha moment” for the listener

Comments from the floor:

- there is someone with 600 media appearances who has meagre publication record,
- Some faculty are willing to engage with the public
- Emory rewards PhD students for summarizing their research in one page
- Listener has 35-second attention span
- Self-congratulations does not work with audiences.

9) 29 June, 8:45am, **Keynote: MOOCS, media, and the democratization of higher education by Sir John Daniel, former President and CEO of the Commonwealth of Learning, and former Assistant Director General, Unesco**

- Higher ed is using media to deliver education = democratization of higher ed
- Wider access: higher proportion of population in hi ed but there is graduate unemployment; people decide by themselves where and when to study
- Students determine content; bespoke programmes; DIY courses
- Scientific knowledge is not democratic, but see Wikipedia
- Wider access: St Paul’s letters to priests who commented in church which had no barriers to attend = sounds like correspondence education; there was doctrinal consistency
- Printing press: books in hand of common people; independent study, less deference to authority; McLuhan: the medium is the message
- Railways more print more rapidly to more people over a distance = correspondence ed; Pitman’s shorthand, blackboards 1850s, radio, V, film
- No single technology is revolutionary but a combination can be
- The open university is a synthesis of technology, pedagogy, ideology; it is open as to people, places, methodology, ideas; no admission requirements
- Media industries prone to chronological snobbery (“now is the best”)
- MIT course notes on the web since the 1990s
- MOOCS: history, positive aspects (press coverage created more awareness of on-line learning); new pedagogy to augment/replace traditional lecture; negative aspects: easy in, difficult out
- He created a free on-line A guide to Quality in Online Learning www.sirjohn.ca.

Q from the floor: what is the revenue model for on line ed?

A: open university courses are only good if backed by and partnered with institutions with credential capacity

Q: open ed resources work the same for all disciplines?

A: MOOCS are relevant for all disciplines but they must be tailored to specific contexts.

Q: how are MOOCS different from a library?

A: on line is open to anyone in the world; but campus experiences is different from MOOCS

10) 21 June, 10:00 am. Student protests or civil society mobilization? Media depictions in Quebec, US (California/ occupy movement), and UK

Moderator: Scott Jaschik, Editor, Inside Higher Ed

Panelists: Gabriel Nadeau-Dubois, Former spokesman, Broad Coalition of the Association for Student Union Solidarity

Jesse Rosenfeld, Freelance journalist and contributor to The Nation, The Guardian, Al-Jazeera

Elizabeth Redden, Reporter, Inside Higher Ed

Anna Goldfinch, Ontario National Executive Representative, Canadian Federation of Students

Nadeau-Dubois had three points about coverage of the Quebec student protest:

1. It was difficult to understand student movement structure as the unions are centralized but democratic: he was a spokesman, not a leader
2. Generally the media put a lot more attention to the action of protest not on the ideas and issues; it was frustrating since in the 29 weeks of strike only the first 3 wks were 50% dedicated to coverage of ideas, then , attention shifted to arrests, protests, etc.
3. 2 main distortions led to angry reaction toward the media, so by the end of the strike the journalists were attacked by the students; student activists misunderstood journalists. There was a rising importance of columnists over journalists; out of 15 leaders in the press, 13 were against the strike, 1 neutral and 1 for student demands.

Rosenfeld: Canadian young generation was responding to austerity: tuition fees were a “pretext”; old media unable to see the real discontents (joblessness, the use of global \$ to privatize education). The Occupy Movement had similar issues: joblessness, debt. Students were frustrated about getting beaten up by police about their future but media talks only about tuition.

Redden: Why are there not student unions in the US? In the US, students cannot believe that tuition elsewhere is \$2000 – what is a reasonable tuition? In the US, there are cultural traditional reasons why there are not mass protests: there is not one set of rules, states operate differently. Higher Ed wrote about the Occupy Movement from technical matters: number of arrests, police overreaction, disconnect between media and protesters because journalists focussed on ends and were biased for concrete and realistic demands, whereas students were against ideological issues (realists vs idealists).

Goldfinch: in Ontario, increased tuition fees are a fact of life; students are taking unpaid internships, students in Ont. In a status quo situation, media can contribute or can challenge the status quo (readers think students are “narcissistic” and “believe they feel an “entitlement” to

everything. But there are other models: Germany; everyone has to challenge the status quo: faculty, administrators too.

Q from the floor: protests are much more than about “more”, the press is not reporting about wider issues.

A: in Quebec, the Occupy Movement was not linked to the student protest, since students had specific demands. The media is not good at explaining systemic economic issues.

11)

21 June, 11:15 am. **A different kind of gatekeeping: What can we expect of the professions of (and relationships between) higher education and of journalism in the next 10 years?**

Moderator: Mary Beth Marklein, Higher Education Reporter, USA Today

Panelists: Philip G. Altbach, Professor of Higher Education, Boston College
Glen Jones, Professor, University of Toronto, Ontario Research Chair for
Postsecondary Education Policy and Measurement
Karen MacGregor, Global Editor, University World News

Altbach: there will be significant changes in media and higher ed; there is already an interest in international higher ed; readers want to hear much more info about higher ed.

Jones: before, there were only peer reviews, few public intellectuals, now colleagues have blogs, web sites: transparency is associated with profs (this was not the case in the past); there is another depth with which research is covered.

MacGregor: the horizon should be 3-4 years, not 10; quality: dumbed down; specialized field media on the increase; possible financial trouble for print media, but it will survive; states control content of on line info; researchers offer content to broader public by using specialized publications; there is a change in reading habits: now tiny digestible chunks needed (both university and media).

Jones: academics need media and need blogs.

Altbach: public believes in gatekeepers, wants to know who to trust; media has to be willing to become gatekeepers; democratization of knowledge can take it too far.

Q from moderator: What are the big interesting stories re higher ed in the next 4-5 years? What are the fruitful areas of research re higher ed?

Altbach: the keyword is “global”: for mass higher ed, and economy; massification spawned for profit, increased visibility of researchers and rankings.

Jones: implications of academic work changing and transforming: international job markets change research traditions; there is increasing fragmentation, i.e. no full time professoriate, so the vast majority of teachers are not engaged in research.

MacGregor: international mobility of students; talent war.

12)21 June, 1:30pm. Reflections on the adaptive nature of journalism and higher education

Moderator: James Bradshaw, Higher Education Reporter, Globe and Mail

Panelists: Janice Neil, Associate Professor of Journalism, Ryerson University

Ken Steele, Co-Founder, Academica Group

Rick Salutin, Columnist, Toronto Star

Megan Clement, Deputy Editor, The Conversation UK

Neil: adaptation: listening to young people, leveraging their knowledge, shaping and crafting their skills; projects involving 1. Shadowing journalists, 2. reader as citizen. Solutions offered by master students.

Steele: huge sector change underestimated in higher ed, but not in media; media fixated on “new”; media is not producing knowledge; universities tend to conserve the past; there are technical disruptions and fragmentations in media: citizen bloggers, 40% of young people read social media. Newsrooms shrunk massively, with the result that the cameraman is also a journalist, editor, etc. Business models are collapsing: bookstores, music, Blockbuster. Virtualization of textbooks, lectures. Older voters want tax money to go to health. Government funding based on employment outcomes not on number of students enrolled. Rising anti-intellectualism, resentment for public sector: facing barbarians at the gate.

Clement: both in academia and media: the Internet is disrupting traditional ways; everyone has an opinion, but where is the informed comment? The shift is toward openness – bring expertise to the public in an open content and with transparency.

Salutin: in journalism and in higher ed, change is occurring and therefore dysfunctions arise. In TO, what has gripped the readers’ imagination is an old fashioned reporting about the mayor: i.e. what’s happening and how is it relevant? In higher ed, Harold Innis’ plea to university to remember that students and teachers are human. Virtual reality is not a problem for youth. According to him, Power Point and Facebook are over, since they cut off human contact. How are real adaptations ongoing regarding people value.

Q from Bradshaw: the premise is that media and university experiencing crisis: who sets the core values? Practitioners or consumers/readers?

Steele: government financing will decide.

Salutin: but elections are every 4 years. Who will decide is in contention. Corporate sector. The people who are screwed are young people – they have savvy and moral righteousness.

Clement: young people must learn to pay for traditional media – there’s a shift toward paying for everything.

Neil: 77% of Tweets go back to newspapers/news media. Redefine “news” – personal? Social?

Salutin: how do you pay for the positive aspects of these institutions to keep them going?

Q from the floor: is adaptation a function of the generation gap? Decisions are being made without consulting young people. Generational clash: people's values are not true any longer.

Salutin: What is the value of universities? They are not job adapting machines, what they are good at is developing critical thinking, therefore the university should shrink $\frac{3}{4}$ of size. Reputation and quality is not the point, getting a job is. Students want an outcome, but also process like small classes and know the profs.

Steele: institutions are competitive, but Ontario has no system-level policies, no strategic policy.

13) 21 June, 2:45. Who are the MOOC users? Insights from media and higher education

Moderator: Joe Wilson, Education Cluster, MaRS Discovery District

Panelists: Aron Solomon, Educator and Entrepreneur

Melonie Fullick, Freelance journalist, Doctoral Candidate, York University

Gavin Adamson, Assistant Professor of Journalism, Ryerson University

Andrew Ng, Founder, Coursera, Associate Professor, Stanford University

Wilson: Who are the MOOC users? What is the intersection with the media?

Fullick: the problem of MOOCs is that they are opposed to other questions regarding higher ed policies. Not who is using them, but what characteristics should the user have to use them:

- Internet connection, not just any connection: video capabilities, reliable, i.e. geographic issues
- Computer equipment
- Computer literacy – exposure to interactive process
- Language proficiency: majority of courses in English, some in Spanish
- Users have post-secondary education
- Users who complete courses are males
- Learning styles, ability/disability not covered
- Self-disciplined learner able to complete, self-motivated, with metacognitive awareness

Solomon: MOOCs are a first world issue. He calls them MOO COWS until you get to China: you must deliver on the technology they use.

Ng: Coursera and MOOCs are not the same as 2 years ago. We now have the technology to deliver to 150 000 students, including homework and feedback, answer questions, and certificates are received. The demographics: working adults, developing communities, disabled, male-dominant, computer science, most have BA degrees.

Wilson: Writing about MOOCs: what's the spin to make a story interesting?

Fullick: there are many policy issues implicated in MOOCs but inside higher ed opinion pieces take an extreme position. Massification, economy of scale, tuition not discussed in depth: to make it interesting, media make it simple.

Ng: is it frustrating to be mischaracterized in the media? No, he's grateful, since he can answer with more depth: one prof. teaching 100 000 students: implications about

- The changing role of the instructor
- Value of services higher?
- Where will future revenues come from?

Media does not affect Coursera adversely: mixing of on-line and F-to-F pedagogy.

Solomon: "tech" media is about what the next shining thing is. People want accreditation.

Fullick: The media have a parallel discussion: issues discussed changed: first, technical. Critical points of view coming from blogs; narrative woven about history of MOOCs.

Ng: scrutiny about the business model: clear intention, let university adopt content and technical companies make other products. He's not worried about sustainability. MOOCs are held to different standard.

Fullick: funding of higher ed problematic especially in the US: whoever is seeking answers to rising costs, the expectations are high.

Ng: he is appalled at the idea that MOOCs are used as a weapon to fund universities.

Fullick: articles celebrate the idea of outsourcing and using MOOCs as cheaper process, let others do it.

Q from the floor: the cycle is the same as "satellization" for global audience: must localize with partners.

Ng: courses in English, Spanish, Italian, Chinese. Who better to teach Chinese history than a Chinese prof?

Q from the floor: Are MOOCs a counter to open source?

Ng: Coursera is a hosting platform: if a student cannot afford it, they will let him take it anyway.

Wilson: Media must accept faculty views and faculty must make their opinions known. Media ignored the fear faculty shows (to protect their own stuff): Harvard faculty's concerns ignored by university to they went to the general media. Concerns about data mining, and therefore ethical implications. Where is the voice of the user?

Ng: reality is messy: it is not clear how this is affecting students. Students and teachers don't have media savvy.

Fullick: individual stories are not enough if you are talking about 150 000 cases. The purpose of the courses is not clearly enunciated. If students do not have a choice, is this the type of education they want?

Ng: the worry is that MOOCs will replace profs: but it will not happen. MOOCs are an opportunity to put lecture content once in order to have f-to-f relationship with students. This is to help students get degrees. We had a shot to change the world: great education is not reserved for the elites, it is a fundamental right.

Q from the floor: management in colleges happy not to have profs: the idealism of Coursera is not shared by institutions. Also, student cannot follow threads with 60 registered.

Fullick: but what's the goal? What's the context for introducing MOOCs? Why? We can pay people less.

14) Closing remarks. The conference was an opportunity to bring people together who do not normally converse about issues at hand.

Part 2: Personal reactions to the conference

A conference is successful if the papers/presentations/panels address the main ideas/questions put forth in the description. Many of the sessions lacked this connection. In other words, I was expecting every panel to address connections/similarities/differences between journalism and higher education, but many panels did not deal with this main topic.

The conference was predicated on doing something different, not to have the usual 20 minute presentations followed by 10 minutes of discussion. In this way, it fell into the trap of contemporary "fluid" and fragmented flow of bits of information: the "informal conversational style" of the form 'moderator-panelists' often resulted in conversations taking a life of their own, without following the proposed theme. As a consequence, the audience did not come out with a firm grasp on that proposed theme. It was as if the educational professionals were afraid to do what they are accustomed to do: speak about their research in a coherent, cogent manner for more than 5 minutes. Granted, the informal conversation was sometimes choc-full of good ideas, but they were not fully developed and therefore incomplete, shapeless and easily forgotten.

Keywords: unpaid internship, crowd- out/sourcing, crisis, authority, transparency, trust, inequality, blurring of meaning.

All in all, however, it was interesting to compare journalists' and educators' professional lives being transformed under the weight of technology and financial crisis. It is clear that what was missing was both a governmental position and a big business perspective. And, as much as the conference described itself to be "democratic", there were very few students both in attendance and as speakers. The conference also stressed the importance of contextualizing, a matter to which I will devote more thought while preparing for the next academic term.

Report to YUFA

June 27, 2013

2nd International Conference: Worldviews 2013

“Global Trends in Media and Higher Education”

June 19, 20, 21, 2013

The conference began on June 19, 2013 with an opening reception at 6:30 pm at Massey College, University of Toronto.

Thursday June 20 and Friday June 21 were two intense days filled with great sessions around the following themes:

- 1. Newsflashes from the global campus: Reporting trends, interpretations and relationships.**
- 2. Hooking up or a long-term relationship? Future depictions of the professoriate and of journalism.**
- 3. Unlocking the tower. How trends in media, citizenry, and government are altering the academy.**

The conference had concurrent sessions and therefore my colleague Jana Vizmuller-Zocco and I tried our best to go to separate sessions as to provide more fulsome reports that captured the spirit of the conference in general.

June 20th: Keynote Address: Chad Gaffield, President, SSHRC “Understanding people: How new insights are transforming campuses, companies, communications in the Digital Age” (8:45 am)

Highlights:

- Begins with a history of mass schooling in the 18th, 19th, 20th centuries
- Asks “Is post-secondary education simply becoming 18th-19th C elementary education?”
- Are new media becoming “old newspapers”?
- Schools were built but we didn’t focus on how children actually learn (this changed only in the past few decades)
- Spoke about a T-shaped model to “broaden” and “deepen” knowledge through: co-op, in-service learning, collaborative learning, paid internships, exchanges, crowdsourcing, community based research
- Mentions the idea of “citizen science”
- That the engagement model is discipline based but should go beyond and become deeply conceptual; renewable competencies
- These challenges and changes are being enabled, accelerated and influenced in iterative ways by digital technologies
- Spoke about 3 deep conceptual changes: creativity, diversity and complexity
- Need for “specialization” AND “conceptualization”
- Discussed issues surrounding digital divide, social inequality

Discussion ensued at question period regarding: merit review vs. peer review at SSHRC: expanding the notion of review; going outside of Canada for adjudicators.

Concurrent Session C (10:20 am)

“Branding and the sophistication of the communications culture at universities”

Moderator: Ken Steele

4 panelists: Gili Dori, Stavros Rougas, Larry Arbeiter, Larry Lauer

Each panelist had a chance to speak for a few minutes. Audience participation was encouraged.

Larry Lauer, Vice-Chancellor for Government Affairs, Texas Christian University, began with a more formal address.

Highlights:

- Marketing as a way of thinking
- Brand as the primary product
- Brand as a set of characteristics that differentiates an institution from another; delineating differences and see if and what kind of competitive edge comes out; what stands out
- Stand out features could include: the strength of certain programs; special experiences and how to characterize them; cultural characteristics, geographical distinction (where is the univ located), any particular set of values
- Need to brainstorm with all constituencies in university
- Helps determine what type of experience students will choose/they can relate to along with academic experience
- “internationalization” of academia: as we become more and more global, we need to stand out to compete
- Donors, alumni, prospective students, parents: looking for a certain identity which is therefore linked to brand definition

Larry Arbeiter, AVP U of Rochester responded that the branding process is sometimes especially in older institutions with a long history

Stavros Rougas, Co-founder of MediaSpotME spoke about private vs. public universities and gave the example of Western University who re-branded itself (even its name changed); it excels in different areas vs. University of Waterloo who builds its brand around engineering and computer science; this pulls people in.

Gili Drori, Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, took us through university branding and in particular the LOGO and how branding is expected in the 21st century; related to mediatization; logo as only the tip of the iceberg in branding; doesn’t always distinguish the brand clearly; gave many examples of traditional logos (of the guild), logos reflecting the

location of a particular school, logos of the generic type that do not indicate clearly that the brand is a university; her study looked at over 11,000 logos.

Question centred around why faculty resist branding: possible answers: because identity is being overshadowed by commercialization, marketing, mediatization, marginalization

Panelists suggested that perhaps communications and public affairs depts. should build better relationships with faculty members; should do “hero” communications pieces to highlight faculty achievements, like McLuhan or Frye at U of T.

The “danger” of becoming the “media star prof” who sometimes becomes the target of colleagues’ envy; other questions/issues raised: why is it so difficult to do internal communications in higher ed?; we see a lot of uncoordinated efforts; lack of institutional support (i.e. funding) for this kind of thing; does branding/marketing clash with academic culture? Do we have just too many post-secondary institutions to be able to really distinguish ourselves?

Product vs. communications’ focus in marketing: communicating to customers, students, international students that “product” or “those products” that universities “sell”. There were differing opinions around the room.

Concurrent Session B (11:15 am)

“National security, social media and the publicity of academic findings”

David Miller, Professor of Sociology University of Bath

Sarah Kendzior, Writer for *Al-Jazeera* and *Foreign Policy*

Larry Lauer, Vice-Chancellor for Government Affairs, Texas Christian University

All three panelists introduced themselves and spoke about their various experiences.

S. Kendzior highlights:

- Ph.D. in anthropology; writer for *Al-Jazeera* English
- Spoke about the inequality in higher education and the fact that academic paywalls hurt public knowledge because there is no access to those without a university affiliation
- Spoke about Edward Snowden and Aaron Schwartz and leaking information

D. Bath highlights:

- Social media activist; founder of Spinwatch
- Role of institutions re: the complex situation regarding national security and academic research

Larry Lauer highlights:

- With privacy gone, we need to see how we (as academics) fit into this chaos

- Mentions Wikileaks
- Asks what is our role

Panelists went on to engage the audience in an interactive session which included the following:

- Discussion of civil disobedience: short jail terms for long term solutions and being right
- Career trajectory: time lag re: publishing and availability of academic work; academics need to be more open and put their work out there, widely available online; for ex. Terrorism research
- How military intelligence agencies can influence research
- Dismantling the culture of fear and of false perceptions
- Shift through social media: some changes after Aaron Schwartz died; pdf tribute movement

Interview with : Andrew Keen (author) via Skype (1:30 pm)

“The sinking ship of the tide lifting all boats? The impact of technology on media and higher education”

Interviewed by Joel Westheimer, Professor of Education, U of Ottawa

- Author of two books: *The cult of the amateur* and *Digital Vertigo*
- Second book based on Hitchcock’s movie *Vertigo*
- Age of voyeurism and surveillance
- The “blonde” in social media =that the social cannot solve all our problems (i.e. like alienation) vs. what Zuckerberg tells us
- Mentions Clay Shirky: audience and author as one in the 21st century
- *The Cult of the Amateur* is a critique of a culture of anonymity; we need to stop being afraid of being alone and actually thinking
- we are forgetting the value of being alone; lights are always switched on: Facebook as “a well-lit dorm” according to Zuckerberg (defined as a utilitarian)
- notion of PANOPTICON and new media
- Is there potential for Social Media to be positive? Keen says yes but also that he is a polemicist and criticizes it: Occupy movement was weakened by SM: no leadership, no structure, no political coherence, no goals
- Brings up question: How do social media help with political struggle?
- Talks about the way technology allows us to perform our lives and the notion of technological architecture
- Makes references to George Orwell’s *1984* and Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World*

Concurrent Session C “Student protests or civil society mobilization? Media depictions in Quebec, US (California/Occupy Movement) and UK” (notes taken by Jana Vizmuller-Zocco)

We both attended this session.

DAY 3 JUNE 21 8:45 am

Keynote: Sir John Daniel

“MOOCs, Media and the democratization of Higher Ed”

Highlights:

- Use of media to teach students
- Knowledge is not democratic: i.e. we don't ask the public to vote on scientific research/discoveries; but then look at Wikipedia
- Gives us historical facts surrounding the printing press, the blackboard, and other types of tech
- Talks about the OPEN UNIVERSITY (UK 1970s): wider access, no admission requirements, more than 250000 enrollments, 5th in UK rankings
- One CAN deliver education properly with technology; evolutionary process
- Students would design their own programs
- States that the OPEN U revolutionized correspondence education;
- Gives examples of universities that are using open courseware programs, for wider access, open educational resources (OER), sharing materials; open licensing of materials
- In BC, some places have open online textbooks for free (but who pays the author? Wasn't clear)
- MOOCs: began in Canada at U of Manitoba with a course entitled: Connectivism and Connective Knowledge: 25 on campus paying students + 2300 public, non-paying students enrolled
- Describes MOOCs at Harvard, MIT, Stanford
- Free courses BUT NO Credit for them at most universities
- New pedagogy to replace traditional lecture: warns not to turn it into PR: needs to be a serious effort
- A lot still needs to be fleshed out regarding MOOCs and OER
- Contact www.sirjohn.ca for more info

Concurrent Session C 11:15

“The Under-reported story: The role of university campuses in the Arab Spring”

Participants: S.H. (Student via Skype from Egypt: American Univ. in Cairo)

Sarah Kendzior (Al-Jazeera reporter and Ph.D. in Anthro)

Jesse Rosenfeld (freelance journalist and contributor to Al-Jazeera, the Guardian, The Nation)

Tony Burman (News and documentary producer CBC; also worked for Al-Jazeera for 4 years in Qatar and USA)

Highlights:

- Jesse Rosenfeld: public squares being seized around the world vs. just an online revolution
- Egypt and Tunisia: fighting against authoritarian rule; urban based opposition; process of discontent and disillusionment (i.e. post-Mubarak); inability to achieve demands of revolution
- In Turkey: similar generation of youth even though it wasn't a Mubarak type regime; anger at cops and security; increasing polarization
- In Palestine: no regional style revolt but some demonstrations by students
- Technology is enabling people to communicate with one another globally: "young global revolt"
- S.H.: revolution is still ongoing; 18 days were just the start; fighting for human rights, fighting against torture, poverty;
- Using blogs to get world to listen; when Internet was cut off for 5 days, went to square to protest' still many arrests today for protesting; many unfairly accused of being part of Black Block
- Does Egyptian press cover what's going on in universities? Yes but with high security in public universities; in private univ, rejection of any type of political mobilization; many clashes between security and students
- Sarah Kendzior: digital media and authoritarian states: does work in Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan; mentality among people is not to participate because of fear, constant surveillance, erosion of social trust; self-censorship, threat of punishment; Social media are censored in Uzbekistan; Azerbaijan not censored but can be arrested if found on "wrong" sites
- Universities in central Asia are not bastions of free speech and learning
- Role of the diaspora is especially important through Social Media...Mobilization from the outside?
- Tony Burman: talks about 3 things that shaped him: Soviet Empire break up; Arab Spring; 1960s revolt amongst young people (i.e. Vietnam War)
- Spoke about the digital and online dimension of Al-Jazeera English and how new organizations are using different mechanisms to disseminate information and tap into youth and universities.