MINUTES
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
INNOVATION AND ONLINE COMMITTEE
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
BOCA RATON, FLORIDA
NOVEMBER 6, 2014

*Video or audio archives of the meetings of the Board of Governors
and its Committees are accessible at http://www.flbog.edu*

1.   Call to Order

Chair Ned Lautenbach convened the meeting at 10:05 a.m. on November 6, 2014, with
the following members present and answering roll call: Vice Chair Edward Morton;
Richard Beard; Dean Colson; Tom Kuntz; Wendy Link; Norman Tripp; and Pam
Stewart. A quorum was established. Dr. Katherine Robinson joined the meeting at 10:09
a.m.

2.   Approval of the Committee Minutes

Mr. Colson moved that the Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on
September 18, 2014, as presented. Ms. Link seconded the motion, and the members
concurred.

3.   Committee Initiatives

a.   Work Plan for the Development of the Strategic Plan for Online Education:

Chair Lautenbach stated that the Committee will be developing a strategic plan for
online education that will support the Board's overall strategic plan for 2025. He said
that the Committee and Board have already done a lot of work in this area, from the
Parthenon Report that resulted in the creation of UF Online, to creating the Task Force
on Online Postsecondary Education in Florida, whose recommendations the Committee
has begun to implement.

Chair Lautenbach recognized Dr. Nancy McKee, who said that a strategic plan for
online education could be used to guide the development of policies and legislative
budget requests. She indicated that during the course of developing a strategic plan for
online education, issues that need to be addressed include those related to student FTE
projected for 2025; completion rates for online students and strategies for improving
those rates; faculty support; online programs needed to address workforce needs;

opportunities for collaboration; and assessing the quality of online programs and services, including Complete Florida, Complete Florida Plus, and UF Online.

Dr. McKee said that President John C. Hitt from the University of Central Florida agreed to chair the task force that would be drafting the strategic plan. She said the Committee will still be given updates and will be brought any issues that need to be discussed to help guide the task force in the development of that plan. She said that Chair Lautenbach, as well as the Board staff, will be engaged in the development of the plan.

Chair Lautenbach stated that the strategic plan for online education will set the framework for where the system should be and drive the work of the Committee related to online education. He said the timeline has not been determined for completion of the plan, but, hopefully, it will be finished next year.

Mr. Beard moved to approve the work plan for developing the strategic plan for online education. Mr. Colson seconded the motion, and the members concurred.

b.   Learning Management System (LMS)

Chair Lautenbach continued the discussion regarding the recommendation of the Task Force on Online Postsecondary Education for an opt-in common Learning Management System. He explained that several surveys have been conducted since the June meeting to determine whether having a common LMS would add any value to the system.

Dr. McKee explained that surveys were given to students and faculty in the State University System, chief information officers in both the State University System and the Florida College System, and representatives of the Members' Council for Distance Learning and Student Services, which is an advisory body for the Florida Virtual Campus and is composed of representatives from every institution in the SUS and FCS. She explained that almost 17,000 students responded, over 2,800 faculty members, 10 out of 12 SUS chief information officers, 23 out of 28 Florida College System CIOs, eight university Members Council representatives and 19 Florida College System representatives on the Members Council.

Key findings of the students and faculty surveys included:
• 59% of university students felt that it was important or very important to have the same LMS throughout the SUS, while 31% of university faculty respondents said it was important or very important.
• 65% of student respondents had used more than one LMS.
• Of the students who had used more than one LMS, 47% said it had created obstacles for their learning efforts (27% felt that obstacles were temporary; 55% felt that they were minor, but ongoing; and 17% felt that obstacles were major and ongoing).

- Of the students who said using more than one LMS created obstacles, 82% said they spent too much time searching for resources and functions because of differences in the systems; 61% felt some faculty were not adept at using the systems; and 30% felt that student support for the systems was lacking.
- 650 students wrote comments that indicated that using more than one learning management system complicates work and adds confusion.
- 35% of faculty said that they have never used more than one LMS.
- 29% of faculty who had used more than one LMS said such usage had no effect on their ability to do their work; 14% said it positively affected their ability to do work; and 23% said it had had a negative impact. Of those who said that using more than one had had a negative effect on their ability to do their work, 82% said it was because it was time-consuming to convert courses from one LMS to another.

Key findings of the CIO surveys included:
- Of the 10 university respondents, four said their institutions used Blackboard, three (soon to be four) used Canvas, one uses Desire2Learn and one uses Moodle.
- 6 of the 10 responding institutions (soon to be seven) have their LMS hosted by an external entity.
- All responding CIOs said their learning management system is integrated with other systems, such as access/ID management systems, social networking sites, HR systems, and student information systems.
- Challenges with fully implementing a different LMS included conversion of course content, faculty acceptance and transition, and re-building multiple integrations.

Dr. McKee said that survey responses from CIOs, faculty members, and Members' Council representatives indicated that it was important to have faculty and students involved in the LMS selection process. The Members Council for Distance Learning and Student Services indicated that a common LMS would provide consistency for students and faculty and would provide consortial level pricing and benefits. The weaknesses included that there would be less leverage in pricing if adoption were low, and the cost of implementation may prevent participation. She said the Members Council indicated that having no common LMS would mean that no start-up costs would be required and institutional control would be maintained; however, students and faculty would still have inconsistency across institutions, and money would be wasted due to individual institutional purchases, rather than consortial pricing.

She indicated that the vast majority of both CIOs and Members Council representatives would recommend an opt-in approach for a common LMS. A few Florida College System representatives recommended that a common system be required or required with the option to opt-out with justification. She noted that three universities which had recently changed to different learning management systems were asked to estimate their direct and indirect costs for the transition. The range for direct costs was from $300,000 to $500,000. Indirect costs were greater because of faculty time spent on

converting courses to different learning management systems. In addition, creating new documentation was also labor intensive and a part of the indirect costs.

Chair Lautenbach said that a common LMS makes sense when trying to create a large virtual school where students can easily access all schools and their classes. He said community colleges' buy-in would be important, because of transfer policies.

Mr. Tripp said that the Committee needs to look at where the system needs to be 20 years from now; the system cannot stay the same. He said community colleges need to be accommodating students for when they transition to universities. He said that an opt-in approach would not work.

Mr. Colson said that the college system seems to be very important in this discussion. He said that the Board of Governors has no jurisdiction over colleges and asked how would a common LMS logistically happen. He asked if the Legislature would get involved or would it be the State Board of Education. Chair Lautenbach responded that, first, the SUS must agree. He recommended putting a plan in place to pick one LMS and then start talking about who needs to change. Commissioner Stewart said that colleges in the Florida College System need to be involved in the process and the State Board of Education would be the one voting on the issue. Ms. Link stated that 28 college presidents get together monthly and college trustees get together periodically, and she expects that they will be receptive to the plan.

Mr. Huizenga said that adoption comes from the top. He noted that the number of responses from some universities indicate they had not embraced the concept of a common LMS. He said it is important to get everyone to participate; otherwise, a selection might be made that universities might not like.

Mr. Cavallaro said that from a student's perspective, having a common LMS makes sense. He recommended opt-in programs because some universities are stuck in contracts and need time to transition. Mr. Lautenbach suggested going through a process of getting a group together to pick a common LMS and develop a plan to get there. Mr. Kuntz suggested that rather than opt-in to a system, universities should look at contracts first without canceling and when the contracts mature would be the point at which they join the common system. Mr. Tripp said that it is important to move quickly, so universities would know not to sign long-term contracts for different learning management systems.

UF Provost Joe Glover said that when an institution changes to a new LMS, the bulk of the work goes to faculty. UF underwent this process when switching from Sakai to Canvas. The technical work done by the CIO is easy, but the conversion of course work from one LMS to another is a lot of work. Mr. Tripp asked if faculty had assistance when transitioning courses or does each faculty member have to start from the

beginning. Dr. Glover responded that UF provides technical assistance to faculty while transitioning to a new LMS. Mr. Tripp said that they need to educate faculty as to the assistance that they can be provided. Dr. Glover said UF had a two-year phase in, with a voluntary transition of some faculty members during the first period and in the second year, during the mandatory transition, first phase faculty will assist the rest of the faculty.

Commissioner Stewart said she had a final suggestion. On November 17th they will have a workshop on the Florida College System prior to the State Board of Education meeting. She suggested that Chair Lautenbach make a presentation on the common LMS at that meeting.

Dr. Robinson had two concerns: one is to not underestimate the indirect cost because the more complex the course, the more difficult the transition, and the second is that numbers have not been attached to reflect savings. Chair Lautenbach said that the primary purpose of having a common LMS is to help students, not save money. He said institutions that had recently changed their learning management systems estimated the indirect cost as being between $3 million and $6 million. He said that when the Committee gets to that point, members can look at incentives and funding to help with implementation. Ms. Robinson said that it is not a resistance to a change, but the physical acts of the change that concern her. Chair Lautenbach said that it is not a simple process, but it has been done before.

Mr. Tripp moved to direct staff to start development of a common Learning Management System, involve universities, put together a work plan, and move as fast as possible. Mr. Kuntz seconded the motion, and all members concurred.

4.   Concluding Remarks and Adjournment

Chair Lautenbach said that this initiative will take a lot of time, a lot of effort, and a lot of cooperation. He said it would be for the good of students in the state and would assist in creating a virtual school across colleges and universities.

Chair Lautenbach thanked the members for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 10:38 a.m.

_____

Ned Lautenbach, Chair

_____
Nancy C. McKee, Ph.D.
Associate Vice Chancellor