BOARD *of* GOVERNORS
State University System of Florida

Learning Management Systems (LMS)

Dr. Nancy C. McKee, Associate Vice Chancellor
November 6, 2014

www.flbog.edu

Importance of a common LMS

Importance of a common LMS...	Students		Faculty	
	Across SUS	**Across SUS/FCS**	**Across SUS**	**Across SUS/FCS**
Very Important or Important	59%	51%	31%	29%
Does Not Matter	23%	29%	21%	22%
Not Especially Important or Not Important at All	18%	20%	48%	48%
Number of Respondents	15,748	15,702	2,640	2,619

Student Usage

- 65% of student respondents have used multiple LMSs in the last 3 years

- 47% (4,905) of those who had used multiple LMSs said it created obstacles for their learning efforts, and these obstacles were:

    - Major ongoing – 17%
    - Minor ongoing – 55%
    - Temporary   – 27%

- The primary reasons why using different LMSs created obstacles were:
    - 82% (3,732) said that too much time had to be spent searching for resources and functions because of differences
    - 61% (2,794) said that some faculty were not adept at using LMSs
    - 30% (1,350) said student support for the LMSs was lacking
    - 650 students wrote additional comments indicating that too many LMSs complicate work and add confusion

Faculty Usage

- 89% of faculty respondents said they had used an LMS within the past three years; 11% said they had not.

- 35% of faculty respondents said they had never used more than one LMS

- 13% of respondents said they had collaborated in the development of a course with faculty from another institution;

    - Of these, 43% used an LMS different from the one used by faculty at the other institution(s).

    - Of the 43%, 66% said that using different LMSs did not affect their ability to do their jobs (27% said it had negatively affected their ability to do their jobs, and 7% said it had a positive affect).

Primary LMS

Primary Learning Management System	No. of Responses	
	SUS	FCS
Blackboard	4	9
Canvas	3	7
Desire2Learn	1	6
Moodle	1	0
Sakai	1 *	1

* Transitioning to Canvas

Technical Information

• 6 SUS responding institutions have their LMSs hosted by an external entity, 3 internally, and 1 both internally and externally. Of responding FCS institutions, 20 are hosted by an external entity, with 3 being hosted internally.

• All institutions have various key systems, tools and resources, and social networking sites integrated with the primary LMS. Examples are:

- Access Management/ID Management Systems
- Social networking sites
- Human Resources systems
- Student information systems
- Communication tools (email, chat, video)
- Course materials and learning objects

Year Contract Ends

Year Contract Ends for Primary LMS	No. of Responses	
	SUS	FCS
2014	0	0
2015	4	7
2016	2	7
2017	2	2
Other	2	7

Challenges with fully implementing a different LMS

Challenges	No. of Responses	
	SUS	FCS
Conversion of Course Content	9	20
Faculty acceptance and transition	9	22
Re-building multiple integrations	10	19
Other	4	12

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the following options:

Options	Strengths	Weaknesses
Opt-in	• Consortial level pricing and benefits • Implementation on own timeline • Consistency for students and faculty	• If low adoption, could affect pricing • Reluctance to opt-in due to cost • Existing contractual obligations
Required, but could opt-out if justified	• Consortial level pricing • Could increase # of inst. Participating • Consistency for students and faculty	• Concerns re: justification & who decides • If low adoption, could affect pricing • Reluctance to participate due to cost
Required	• Best possible negotiating position for pricing • Most consistency for students & faculty • Better opportunities-sharing/collaboration	• Bad for those in long-term contracts or who recently adopted a new LMS • Concern that faculty and students would have no say in adoption • Local needs not considered
No common LMS	• Maintains current systems selected by institutions • No start-up costs, new training, etc. • Maintains institutional control	• Inconsistency for students & faculty across institutions • Inst. Continue to duplicate effort and work in silos • Money wasted due to individual institution vs. consortial purchasing costs

If the SUS and FCS were to pursue a common LMS, would you recommend that it be:

Recommendations	CIOs		Members Council	
	SUS	FCS	SUS	FCS
Opt-in	9	16	6	12
Required, but could opt-out with justification	0	6	0	2
Required	0	0	0	2
No common LMS	1	1	1	1
Alternate	0	0	1	2

• 65% of students have used at least two LMSs in the last 3 years

• 59% of students think it's important or very important to have a common LMS in the SUS

• 47% (4,905) of those responding students who had used multiple LMSs said it created obstacles for their learning efforts, with the primary reason being that they had to spent too much time searching for resources and functions because of differences.

• If the SUS and FCS were to pursue having a common LMS, 9 out of 10 responding CIOs thought it should be on an opt-in basis and 6 out of 8 responding Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services representatives also thought it should be on an opt-in basis.

BOARD *of* GOVERNORS
State University System of Florida

www.flbog.edu