Learning Technologies Advisory Committee | Meeting Summary September 20, 2017

Attendees:
Amy Bautz, Mamoun Benmamoun, Jiajing Chen, Robert Cole, Kyle Collins, Jason Fritts, Matt Grawitch, Stacey Harrington, Jay Haugen, Tim Howell, Lisieux Huelman, Mikael Kriz, Mike Lewis, Debie Lohe, Stephen McMillan, Nathaniel Rivers, Stephen Rogers, Mary Roman, Cindy Rubbelke. David Hakanson (CIO) and Nancy Brickhouse (Provost) attended the first third of the meeting.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting began with brief introductions, led by co-chairs, Debie Lohe and Kyle Collins.

David Hakanson (SLU CIO) thanked committee members for agreeing to serve and described broad changes to LTAC, to IT governance structure, and to IT staffing more generally. IT governance revamped to be more cohesive, efficient, and effective. Biggest change is how new project and budget requests are handled. This moves to a once-per-year process, to allow University leadership to more proactively consider all projects, and their priority levels, at the same time. Mary Roman serves in a new role of Relationship Manager; she will help IT to understand the needs coming from LTAC and other similar committees and bring them forward to IT management. LTAC members will have more data than in years past, as SLU improves ability to access and share data. One big change to staffing/project models: SLU will no longer have a team of project managers. Instead, project managers will be hired on contracts as needed. More changes to IT staffing in coming months. LTAC members asked to share faculty concerns around IT, even if not tied to teaching and learning.

Nancy Brickhouse (Provost) gave committee charge. LTAC's most important role is help her understand teaching and learning technology needs, issues, etc. Her priorities for the year: (1) Academic Technology Commons: opens mid-October. Need to assess whether/how students and faculty are using the space and whether the programming there is what is needed. (2) Online Education: SLU is behind in online learning. Some schools/colleges do a lot, but most are just beginning. Need to make sure there's support, accountability for quality and consistency, and scalability. Tracy Chapman (dean of SPS) providing leadership in this area. Will be important to consider how SPS appropriately help support online learning across the University. Nursing also does strong work here and is especially good at creating communities of learners. (3) Blackboard: is it the right tool, what is LTAC members' take on it. The School of Medicine is interested to change the LMS, and LTAC will consider whether or not to recommend a change. Dr. Brickhouse asked LTAC members what they think of Blackboard. Responses will inform LMS review process. Generally, LTAC members open to/interested in reviewing LMS but expressed deep concerns about timing (do not want rapid change with so many other technology changes).

Debie briefly described changes to LTAC and general expectations and workflow/processes. LTAC members are representational, to bring info back and forth from LTAC to departments, and represent a wide set of perspectives. Mary Roman's role is to represent IT, keep the committee informed, and translate between faculty and IT. Stacey Harrington, Mike Lewis, and Jay Haugen are non-voting resource roles. When it comes to issues to bring to the LTAC agenda, there are no "too small" issues. We don't want to close down input. We are going to be good stewards of your time. Information delivery will come via email in advance of meetings, including agenda and material to be reviewed prior to meeting. These will be working meetings, and the committee chairs may ask the committee to weigh in electronically between meetings.

Kyle and Debie laid out the 2017 - 2018 priorities and projects. These include:

- IT Roadmap: Started 2 yrs ago to give a picture of the timing of projects. First two pages are projects approved for FY 18. This committee will be focused on projects re: learning technologies.

- Lecture Capture replacement Pilot: Previous LTAC chose YuJa for pilot as a replacement for Tegrity. Tegrity will NOT remain at SLU. LTAC (current and maybe last year's) will decide to either move forward with YuJa or not in time for November CADD meeting.

- Changes in IT classroom support: SLU moving to contract based classroom support, outsourced through TSI. Method for requesting classroom support to remain the same. If there are issues, please convey.

- Institutional planning for online education: There will be a concerted effort to get an institutional plan that will require info back and forth from this group.

- Learning Management System (LMS) review: Committee will see several LMS demos. This includes understanding what other versions of Blackboard (we don't use/have) could do. Kyle asked what features do we want to know about or see demonstrated? The committee answered:(1)Collecting data for HLC/accreditation processes, (2) Learning outcomes, (3) How to allow students to share work; how can direction be shifted from classroom to public, (4) Mobile device compatible, and (5)User friendly features for online teaching/learning. A number of concerns expressed about the timeline.

In the time remaining (and immediately afterward), LTAC members shared current T&L technology concerns in their areas: (1) loss of the gradebook / Banner integration with summer 2017 upgrades; (2) exam software and proctoring software both used in some schools/colleges, but is there an opportunity for University-wide support / adoption of those? (3) need for interactive and editing capability in lecture capture and LMS (YuJa pilot will be good for this, as the tool has robust editing and interaction capabilities Tegrity does not have).

Decisions / Recommendations Made: None

Learning Technologies Advisory Committee | Meeting Summary 10-18-17

<u>Attendees</u>:
J. Baris, A. Bautz, M. Benmamoun, J. Chen, R. Cole, M. Grawitch, S. Harrington, J. Haugen, T. Howell, L. Huelman, M. Kriz, D. Lohe, S. McMillan, K. Mitchell, S. Rogers, M. Roman, C. Rubbelke

<u>Meeting Summary</u>: The meeting began with brief introductions, led by co-chair Debie Lohe. Next, Robert Cole and Mikael Kriz moved to approve the minutes from the last meeting. Once the minutes were approved, committee was asked to continue sharing current T&L technology concerns in their areas, which fell into two main categories: pressing concerns about ITS support changes and teaching/learning tech issues/needs.

Pressing Concerns about ITS Support:
- [resolved] Wireless outage scheduled for north campus Oct.18, during midterms *[Immediately after the meeting, we learned the outage would be pushed back; Debie emailed LTAC members to let them know.]*
- Software installation requests are now taking much longer than they did in the past, or they are not completed at all. One committee member is still waiting on software installation that he needs urgently to complete a grant proposal. Requests go weeks without attention.
- ITS help desk / support is not responding well; several committee members indicated they work around the Help Desk / email support to directly contact ITS staff who are still here to get resolution.
- Numerous expressions of frustration about ITS cuts and personnel changes. Members requested a published list / org chart so faculty know who is responsible for what and who to contact with concerns.
- One LTAC member initially requested a change in email address with the O365 migration, but he was told to talk to Mark Anderson, who told him to wait until after the conversion. He has asked several times but the request is ignored. (His new email address causes frustration due to confusions about first/last name. This committee member indicated that he is creating a Gmail/business account and sending his email to that because of this issue.)
- Numerous comments and concerns about confusion about and inadequate response to tickets and issues.
- Could ITS set up a generic feedback form online that DOES NOT go to offsite Blackboard (Bb) support, but goes directly to a SLU person? There are numerous concerns and frustrations; need a mechanism to share these directly with ITS.
- Deep concerns about additional ITS cuts that will potentially take place.
- Deep concern that Megan Buckley is leaving; faculty are concerned that she will not be replaced. ITS reps indicated there is a clear need for someone internal to be monitoring Blackboard integrations and other things that Megan has always taken care of.
- There was some sort of Blackboard outage/issue last week with the Banner/script, and students were unable to access courses or materials they previously had access to. Megan resolved this.
- Numerous concerns about ITS Help Desk tickets being ignored for weeks/months (one since June) and/or closed/marked "resolved" without actual resolutions.
- Classroom technology support is not working well. People have to wait an unacceptable amount of time for resolution to issues.
- Blackboard/Banner grade integration is still broken. Mentioned in September meeting – this has been broken since summer upgrade.
- Fallout from the O365 migration continues, and faculty are extremely wary of any additional technology change while email/calendar still feels unstable.

Teaching & Learning Technology Issues/Needs:
- Change fatigue: faculty expressed concern about any new migrations or big changes while they continue to adjust to 365 and ITS support changes / cuts. One faculty member shared that her colleagues have said they simply would not use a new LMS if SLU decides to change.

- Classroom design issues, related to technology (e.g., projection screen is in front of whiteboard)
- Classroom projector issues: screen goes up and down randomly without initiation by the faculty member
- Classroom enhancement desire/need: Wireless projection capability
- Need for institutional approach to Examsoft *(used by multiple colleges/schools)*
- Faculty would like additional information and timeline for other Microsoft product rollout; lost functionality after O365 migration (Google chat, ability for students to schedule meetings on faculty calendar) impacts teaching and interactions with students. When will replacements be available?

Brian Durkee, project manager for the lecture capture project and YuJa pilot, gave the committee a brief summary of LTAC work last year that led to the YuJa pilot, as well as an update on the state of the YuJa pilot. A survey to those currently piloting/testing YuJa will go out next week; results will be shared with LTAC in about two weeks. LTAC will then make a recommendation about next steps, which may include: contract with YuJa (seems unlikely, given current concerns); stay with Tegrity and extend longer-term contract with them; pilot Panopto (the close "runner up" in last year's process), which would likely require a short-term extension of the Tegrity contract; or initiate a new review process.

Mikael Kriz spoke about the Academic Tech Commons currently under construction in the library. The ATC is a joint project between the library and ITS; it has been in the works for almost 3 years. It's based on the concept of a maker space that is academically focused. The IMC is moving into the library and merging with this space. Mikael offered to field any questions that the committee had on the ATC.

- **Q**: When will this open? **A**: Unsure, depends on the air handler and how it functions with fire alarms, which the City of St. Louis has to test before they give their approval for occupancy.
- **Q**: Is this open to faculty? **A**: Yes. **Q**: How does that work? **A**: You can just come in, no appointment needed, or you can make an appointment. You can get assistance with software, hardware, or research.

The library and ITS did a lot of research on new and forthcoming technologies, and tried to bring in technologies that encourage faculty to explore and find new ways of conducting research and teaching with technology. Debie explained that the ATC has 3 key areas of potential for faculty: in their own research and scholarship productions; to create instructional materials; and/or to create creative and nontraditional assignments for students who can then come and work on in that space. The ATC is for faculty use, not just student use. The Reinert Center will work with ATC team and with faculty to provide pedagogical support for developing and assessing creative assignments students could complete with technologies in the ATC. The IMC will have to close for a few days for moving, those dates will be posted ahead of time.

Finally, LTAC returned to the topic of LMS review to continue the conversation started in the last meeting (fleshing out list of functionalities and features faculty want in a LMS) and to ask questions about the purpose of LMS review at this time. Debie explained there are three different types of "needs" for an LMS – technological, institutional, and pedagogical; LTAC members can help with the latter. LTAC need not think of every feature, but minimally can help to prioritize. Mary Roman (ITS) and Debie have started lists and will add ideas generated today. Lists will be shared via Google, with LTAC members adding new ideas until October 25. At that time, Mary Roman will use the list to evaluate possible LMS options to see which products fit our needs. General timeline would be to bring 2-4 vendors in for demos in December, since the committee has to make a recommendation by Jan/Feb, if LTAC wishes to recommend a change in LMS. (If a change is recommended, a new tool probably could not be fully implemented until Fall 2019 at the earliest. This should allay faculty concerns about more changes.)

One LTAC member asked if it was definite that SLU would bring vendors to campus in December; Debie said this would be based on LTAC recommendation. Other LTAC members asked what the motivation was for reviewing the LMS right now. As CIO and Provost explained in the last meeting, the School of Medicine is interested in a possible change. LTAC members asked what the SOM motivation was, and one member said he thought it was

related to accreditation. Another LTAC member asked if SOM uses an LMS now; Mary R. said they use a combination of Blackboard (small amount of use) and Google sites. Debie noted that SOM representatives were not able to attend the meeting; they would be best suited to describe SOM motivation for LMS review. One LTAC member asked if there were security concerns with Blackboard, similar to those driving the email/calendar change; no. Several members expressed concern about the rapid timeline for making a decision/recommendation about whether/how to proceed with possible LMS changes.

Identified LMS Functionality/Features:
- More multimedia functionality, ease of embedding images, videos, text creation.
- Image library (we used to have that but SLU decided to stop paying for it) – there are copyright issues to be considered
- Easy text creation / editor – concern expressed that creating and editing text in Bb is not user-friendly
- Learning analytics and retention tools
- Collaborative space for students to collaborate with the instructor and other students inside the LMS (real time collaboration, peer review) – do not want to go outside the LMS for an external tool
- "Everything in Bb takes too long, they need something more efficient, or click and drag"
- Functionality to capture learning outcomes/goals/assessments, to support accreditation (at institution level/HLC, for regular internal program review, and for discipline-specific accreditation)
- Some faculty want many more integrations – especially publisher and other building blocks tools. However, one LTAC member explained that FERPA is a concern for third-party integrations.
- Easy for non tech oriented faculty to use. One member said, "It takes too much time to do everything in Bb" – grading, assignments, rubrics, tests
- Must have sufficient training and support available to faculty – Blackboard might do some of the things we've discussed, but since training isn't there, people don't know or don't know how to use it.

Some members expressed that we could have many of these functions now, if we paid for additional modules for Bb (but their college has been told in the past that SLU won't pay for those). This is something good to come from new LTAC – different faculty representatives around same table can share needs and work together to identify common needs across the institution. Faculty continued to worry about adding more changes, while one member cautioned that we should not avoid making a good decision about possible LMS change just because people don't like change. One member asked about possible survey of faculty about tools currently used. Question raised about existing features available now but turned off by ITS decision? Debie is exploring this. Possible some features on the list would be available in current Bb installation in nearer-term.

One LTAC member who had to miss this month's meeting shared via email that he felt it was important for the group to consider the question "Why have an LMS?" not just "Which LMS should we have?"

Decisions / Recommendations Made: None

Learning Technologies Advisory Committee | Meeting Summary 11-15-17

Attendees: Jon Baris, Jiajing Chen, Kyle Collins, Jason Fritts, Matt Grawitch, Stacey Harrington, Tim Howell, Lisieux Huelman, Craig Krausz, Mikael Kriz, Debie Lohe, Stephen McMillin, Kyle Mitchell, Nathaniel Rivers, Steve Rogers, Mary Roman, Cindy Rubbelke

Meeting Summary: Meeting began with brief introductions, followed by approval of October meeting minutes. (Matt Grawitch and Nathaniel Rivers moved to approve; one abstention, all others approved.)

Brief informational updates and discussion:
- Megan Buckley position to be filled; ITS working to identify that resource. Until then, Tim Toennies oversees that team (tim.toennies@health.slu.edu), if issues arise. **Q**: who can do course merges? Faculty member was told no one in IT can do that now. **A**: Kyle will follow up.
- Lecture Capture Replacement Project: LTAC clear preference to pilot Panopto next; CADD supportive. In general, LTAC wanted to honor the work of last year's committee by moving forward. Anticipated timeline: begin discussions with Panopto in spring, with summer/fall pilot. Will learn lessons from last pilot and refine process. Ideally, will get the tool in pilot members' hands in summer, so they have ample time to create content for fall pilot. Tegrity contract will be extended for 1 year to accommodate timeline. **Q:** How are pilot instructors identified? **A**: Combination of volunteers and identifying people who engage in diverse types of usage, with diverse audiences. Anyone in LTAC could volunteer. **Q**: Have we ever talked with other institutions using these tools? Should we? **A:** Yes. SLU did talk to YuJa users, but there were fewer of those. Definitely will do this for Panopto; also will want to ask more specific questions. **Suggestion**: contact campuses we know use Panopto (e.g., Illinois), don't just work from list the vendor may give us. Q: Has or would lecture capture ever be used for faculty performance reviews? A: No. We have never given access to anybody other than the faculty member to the recordings. Tegrity use policies reflect this, and this would be the case for any future lecture capture system.
- Other: ATC has opened; Blackboard-Banner grade integration has been fixed; YouCanBookMe has replaced Google scheduling functions; other O365 tool rollout in planning stages. **Q**: YouCanBookMe doesn't do what Google schedule did; does not work for some people; for others in the room, it works as expected. **A**: Contact IT support; should be working. (One LTAC member also offered to help.)

Revisited IT support issues/concerns raised last time: Anything more to discuss? Newslink article provided escalation paths and was helpful. Per Kyle, ITS aware of these issues, actively working to improve. It's a hard adjustment, but committed to improving things. LTAC can contact Kyle if not getting resolution on issues. No new issues emerged in discussion.

Discussion of Teaching and Learning Technology Needs:
- Other technology needs/topics to add to the master list: web-conferencing. Deans and others have expressed concern about Fuze Meeting, including: Fuze requirement to download software; better to have browser-based tool; clunky updates that are forced and can derail use. Skype will be available eventually through O365 tools. SLU will need to determine whether it needs both Fuze and Skype, something else, etc. How many good options does SLU need and should support/pay for? Some members expressed confusion about having multiple tools (Google Hangouts, Fuze, etc.). Fuze is annual contract.
- Need to ensure faculty know that LTAC is here, different, who reps are, how to contact. Suggested Newslink article; LTAC members supportive.
- Need to gather a more comprehensive view of teaching/learning tech needs among faculty. How should we do that? Good discussion of possible methods: survey, direct outreach from LTAC reps, direct outreach from co-chairs or ITS relationship managers to departments (particularly in A&S, given size and complexity). Some members expressed concern faculty would not do a survey, but ultimately settled on combination approach: short survey (i.e., 2-3 open-ended questions + demographics), followed by offer to meet with departments/programs (share patterns in survey results and continue gathering info.). LTAC

members will send the survey to their constituencies, so the request comes from someone in their college, increasing likelihood of response. Members asked for a brief email template to use when sending out the survey link, perhaps referencing the Newslink article. Suggestion to include QR code + link.

- Need to determine process for prioritizing teaching/learning tech needs. LTAC's prioritized list will be one factor considered with future budget requests. Others are Deans' prioritization, IT Advisory Committee, IT Steering Committee (new IT governance process). Some requests will be clearly linked to strategic priorities for institution. Others may be less strategic; some technology priorities will always be at single college/school level, but LTAC can identify overlapping needs (and therefore, perhaps more strategic).

Discussion of LMS Review (priorities, process, timeline):

- We are continuing to refine the list of features/functionalities to guide the LMS review process. The School of Medicine currently is exploring possibility of moving to Canvas. They may do that on their own, or they may wait for completion of LTAC review. (To be determined as Dr. Behrens, Dr. Brickhouse, and CIO Hakanson continue discussions.) Co-chairs recommended LTAC continue with the LMS review process either way because: 1) Blackboard (Bb) contract will be up in two years; seems like a long time, but isn't for LMS review/replacement; 2) current path is to move to Bb Ultra (the newest version of Bb), which is a big enough difference we should be sure it's the right direction for SLU; and 3) review process will help to identify must-have features not currently enabled in Bb, which could be added nearer-term.
- Process/timeline: next steps are to prioritize the top features in the features list and ITS to do a Request for Information, to identify which products might be a good fit. Would aim to bring vendors in for campus-wide demos in January. Typically, vendors do demo on north campus and demo on south campus; we would aim to engage as many campus stakeholders as possible in these demos. Capital requests due in February, but a final decision isn't necessary at that time. We could see where LTAC is in its thinking and make an anticipatory budget request in case a change or pilot is possible.
- Priority features: assessment/accreditation facilitated by LMS; ADA compliance. Other: **Q:** possible to have in-system document markup/grading/feedback? **A:** Possible now via integration tool, [crocodoc](#) (used in Assignments in Bb).
- LTAC members reiterated the need for assessment/accreditation tools in LMS. Blackboard Goals (could be turned on now with no cost); Blackboard Outcomes (would be added module at added cost). May need one/both of these to ensure assessment groups have what they need. Kyle can pursue Bb demo of Goals for LTAC.
- LTAC will spend December meeting prioritizing features list and determining script for demos.

Decisions / Recommendations Made:

- Announce LTAC changes/information in Newslink
- Survey faculty/students/others about teaching and learning technologies
- Follow survey with departmental meetings (as appropriate)
- Move forward with pilot of Panopto
- Kyle will investigate bringing Blackboard rep in for demo of existing Goals functions and Outcomes module.

Learning Technologies Advisory Committee | Meeting Summary 12/20/17

<u>Attendees</u>:
Jon Baris, Amy Batuz, Mamoun Benmamoun, Jiajing Chen, Robert Cole, Kyle Collins, Matt Grawitch, Stacey Harrington, Jay Haugen, Tim Howell, Lisieux Huelman, Craig Krausz, Mikael Kriz, Mike Lewis, Debie Lohe, Nathaniel Rivers, Steve Rogers, Mary Roman, Cindy Rubbelke; ITS guests: Tim Toennies and Whitney Schultz.

<u>Meeting Summary:</u> Began with approval of November meeting minutes. (Matt Grawitch, John Baris moved to approve; one abstention, all others approved.) Debie noted that minutes published to the LTAC website exclude appendices (often things that would not be appropriate to post) and the post-meeting action items list.

Brief Informational Updates:
- Crocodoc / in-line grading function within Bb will no longer be available starting in January due to changes in Bb. Upgrade needed before function can be restored. ITS team working on communication.
- Survey: Approximately 170 responses, all faculty/administrators. No students, no responses from some schools/colleges. Responses are varied and sometimes contradictory. LTAC will discuss in January. Important to identify what we can/should report on and act on. Results will be shared with LTAC – both full results and reports by college/school. <u>Request</u>: if 1-2 LTAC members have expertise in content analysis, it would be good to have someone analyze the data in a systematic way; contact Debie.

Updates on Blackboard Support and Planned Upgrade: Tim Toennies and Whitney Schultz from ITS
- Whitney Schultz replaces Megan Buckley. Megan's open incidents assigned to Whitney
- ITS is exploring different support models with Blackboard, both short-term and long-term.
- Planned upgrade originally scheduled for January will be put off to ensure plenty of time to test and look at changes. There are look-and-feel differences, so it will feel like a change.
- Anticipated timeline: clone current system and install upgrade – end of Jan. Feb: access to LTAC and other heavy users, with feedback and adjustments in March. April, more testing time. Upgrade June 1.
- LTAC members expressed concern with June 1 timeline. Historically, upgrades made commencement weekend, to fall in the gap between sessions. ITS will adjust timeline to accommodate this. If this window is missed, August 12-27 is the next time there won't be courses in session, but that is too late for faculty preparing courses for fall. ITS will aim for May.
- LTAC members will get access and can suggest names of individuals who should have advanced preview of the upgraded version.
- Brief discussion of why upgrade is needed at this time: Bb phasing out certain kinds of functionality and support over time. This upgrade positions us to move from "hosted" to "SAS" (discussed in earlier LTAC meeting). Routine maintenance to ensure we don't get farther behind and risk Bb ceasing support for certain aspects of current installation . Important to distinguish this upgrade (a routine maintenance) from LMS review (process of identifying desired features, etc.). Concerns expressed about upgrading before we've made a decision about possible LMS change; even if LTAC recommends LMS change, this upgrade will be needed, since a full implementation of a new system would be a two-year process. LTAC member expressed the importance of LTAC/communication efforts about the upgrade make very clear this upgrade is not connected to LMS review. Risk: people could misunderstand the changes as a decision to stay with Bb. No communication about upgrade is needed at this time, since we're a couple of months away from seeing it.

LMS Review Update: Craig Krausz announced SOM will officially move to Canvas. Reason: LCME probation / accreditation visit in October. Co-chairs and LTAC members were surprised by this announcement. Discussion about whether/how LTAC moves forward with LMS review. Concerns voiced about whether this adoption by SOM could/would lead to requirement for whole campus to adopt Canvas, as happened with email and in keeping

with centralization efforts. LTAC members do not wish to move forward without assurance from Provost and CIO that two LMSs are possible. If campus will move to Canvas, LTAC members should not spend time in a review process that is not open to all possible outcomes. Mike Lewis stated that campus leadership understands that forcing a change in LMS is much more complicated than forcing a change in email/calendar tool.

If the rest of the campus may stay on Blackboard or change to something else, LTAC will proceed with review for reasons stated last meeting (Blackboard contract ends in two years; Blackboard ULTRA is a different enough product that SLU should be sure it's the right option before moving forward, etc.). ITS has issued a Request For Information from multiple vendors, and they have some dates in mind for vendor demos. Assuming the review proceeds, LTAC members will provide feedback on what to see in vendor demos and on top usability features.

Prioritizing Campus-Wide Technology Requests: Discussion of need for process for LTAC to consider requests for institution-wide technologies (e.g., exam creation tool, student response system). The focus is on technologies where one or more schools/colleges have requested an institutional license for a tool that is currently paid for and supported at the college/school level. Deans are currently engaged in a similar discussion; these two discussions need to intersect. LTAC members were in favor of collecting data on college/school-level technologies already being paid for, to begin identifying priorities. LTAC could then make broad recommendations like, "The University should adopt a campus-wide exam tool," then undertake a process to determine which tool to recommend.

Some discussion of what happens if institutional license is obtained but a school/college needs to use a different product for its own sound reasons. (Example: Law schools have significant and widely known problems using ExamSoft, so would it be allowed to continue using a different tool?) ITS won't tell them they can't use the tool of choice, but there will be a balance between simplifying institutional costs/expenses and fulfilling differing needs. From a financial perspective, we can't guarantee that a school/college won't be told it must use the institutional tool. Concerns were raised about how many "reviews" can be conducted at a time. LTAC members and ITS staff won't have the bandwidth to be reviewing numerous tools at once. Agreed to pull data from deans and review LTAC survey to identify highest-priority categories – likely to be exam tool, student response tool, plagiarism detection tool, publisher integrations – based on the feedback collected so far.

Decisions / Recommendations Made:

- Request clarity from Provost/CIO about the future of LMS review processes/Canvas
- Request information from Provost/Deans about college-funded technologies
- Collect input from LTAC members electronically for vendor demos (assuming LMS review proceeds)

Learning Technologies Advisory Committee | Meeting Summary 01/17/18

<u>Attendees</u>:
Jon Baris, Amy Bautz, Mamoun Benmamoun, Chen Jiajing, Robert Cole, Kyle Collins, Jason Fritts, Matt Grawitch, Jay Haugen, Lisieux Huelman, Mike Lewis, Debie Lohe, Stephen McMillin, Steve Rogers, Mary Roman, Cindy Rubbelke

<u>Decisions / Recommendations Made</u>:
- Take a multi-pronged approach to community engagement for the LMS review, including:
  - An online needs assessment (adapted from one shared by Vanderbilt University), to collect more targeted information specifically about Bb use; include questions that help to filter different types of LMS users
  - In-person listening sessions with faculty councils/assemblies, student groups, other stakeholders (LTAC members will organize via their faculty stakeholders; Co-chairs will attend as many of those sessions as possible, with Mike Lewis and Stacey Harrington helping out when the co-chairs cannot be present.)
  - Multiple Newslink pieces to keep the community informed
  - 2-day vendor campus visits (some targeted sessions, some broad/open demos; one virtual demo per vendor); followed by a feedback survey on the three choices.
  - Create a set of slides to succinctly convey similarities/differences between the three options and share widely as part of the feedback collection post-demos.

<u>Discussion Points</u>:
- Approval of December minutes: Robert Cole moved to approve, Stephen McMillin 2nd. All approve.
- Discussion of informational items:
  - **Lecture capture project update:** ITS is currently clearing out YuJa and working with Panopto to get set up for pilot and talk about pricing. Panopto has some concerns about the number of streaming hours Panopto allows for, since the number seems low for our needs. ITS is working to clarify with Panopto. SLU's historic usage of Tegrity is high compared to other institutions.
  - **ExamSoft update**: No update currently. Deans and ITS working together to explore the possibility of an institutional contract. Co-chairs have communicated to ITS and deans that LTAC members did not have consensus on this in the December meeting and that LTAC wanted to ensure that colleges/schools that need an alternative exam tool would not be forced to begin using ExamSoft.
- Discussion of LMS Review:
  - **General update**: Despite the announcement in LTAC's December meeting, the School of Medicine has not received approval to adopt Canvas. Dr. Pestello has indicated a preference for a single LMS and has requested the LMS review process continue, with SOM participation and with a recommendation to remain with Blackboard or to migrate to a new LMS.
  - **Timeline/Process**: LTAC to continue the process already underway, tentatively aiming at a recommendation in April/May. (Timeline is tentative; awaiting approval from the President.) A significant community engagement process is necessary. This committee will decide what that process looks like. We need at least two days per vendor for demonstrations (one open demo session on each end of campus for each vendor, plus student-only demos, plus IT specific meetings, perhaps others). We anticipate vendor demos in February/March. **Q**: Can we do virtual sessions? **A**: Yes; probably better to have specific session(s) geared to a virtual audience as opposed to making in-person sessions virtually available
  - **RFI update**: Request for Information (RFI) sent to three major vendors, Brightspace (by Desire2Learn), Canvas, and Blackboard. Received two, third due today. RFIs based on the

features list LTAC indicated were a must have (including accreditation, being able to meet ADA compliance, and other things that were identified as priorities). In addition to our features list, they also included the features that they think we should know about. Kyle and Mary Roman will summarize the RFI responses and share summaries and full responses with LTAC. Assuming there are no deal-breakers in the RFIs, we currently plan to bring all three vendors to campus.

- o **Fall survey results**: **Q**: What did you see in the survey results that seems important to consider with the LMS review?
  - Highest responses for "what works well?" was Blackboard. Highest responses to "what needs improvement?" was also Blackboard.
  - People who answered that they wanted Bb improvements mostly seemed to want basic things in Bb (gradebook, file management, and collaboration), basic features of any LMS.
  - People may not know what's possible, and therefore, don't know what to ask for. This indicates that we really need to get people to the demos so that they can see options.
  - **Q**: Do we need to consider weighting the input of those who are heavy sophisticated users versus those who are not? **A**: Maybe (mixed responses); even simple uses of the tool for learning are important. Ultimately need a tool that supports both high and low uses.
  - **Q**: After demos occur, can we make a set of slides or list with what the key differences are btw the vendors? **A**: Yes;
- o How do we engage this community for this process?
  - Discussion of different ideas; group settled on multiple approaches to engage the community: Newslink articles, a needs assessment survey (similar to Vanderbilt example, but with additions), LTAC members to meet with their faculty assemblies, maybe open forums for the whole campus, student focus groups. LTAC members will need to be very proactive in this process to show that we really want to hear from people. Regarding change fatigue, we need to remind faculty/students that change is happening no matter what (since Bb will eventually see upgrades and changes to the look-and-feel), but we can help shape the change. LTAC members will develop a shared set of talking points to ensure consistency across their listening sessions. Targeted Bb/needs assessment survey can be pushed through Blackboard Announcement for all users. Newslink piece won't go out until survey is ready; faculty assembly discussions can tell people about the survey and encourage participation at demos.
- o Priorities for vendor demos"
  - Show only features that are actually live and in production currently (not slides projecting features that don't exist yet); open sessions for anyone combined with more targeted sessions for subgroups – students, people interested in analytics, ITS and registrar.
  - Ideally: brief mentions of assessment and analytics features in general demos, with deeper dive discussions with smaller groups who care more about the details.

Learning Technologies Advisory Committee | Meeting Summary 02-21-18

<u>Attendees</u>:
Jon Baris, Amy Bautz, Mamoun Benmamoun, Jiajing Chen, Robert Cole, Kyle Collins, Jason Fritts, Matt Grawitch, Stacey Harrington, Jay Haugen, Tim Howell, Lisieux Huelman, Craig Krausz, Mikael Kriz, Mike Lewis, Debie Lohe, Stephen McMillin, Kyle Mitchell, Joseph Reznikov, Steve Rogers, Mary Roman, Cindy Rubbelke

<u>Meeting Summary</u>:
- Approval of minutes
  - Motion to approve, Steve Rogers; 2nd Robert Cole; Kyle Mitchell abstained; all others approve.
- Informational updates
  - **Q**: Does University have tech for attendance tracking, way for students to check in for classes. **A:** No. Suggestions: Use iPad to keep attendance by name or photo. What about swipe option for IDs? HR & SGA may have some.
  - **Q**: Are there changes to Banner coming, are we looking at alternate system? **A**: Yes, University is evaluating, no decision made yet, but the committee is interested in Workday. Timeframe: if change is made, HR and Finance would go first, over a couple of years, with Student Information System (SIS) coming last.
  - Blackboard wants to demo Goals and Outcomes on March 20 or 21. Reminder: currently, Goals is included in what SLU pays for; Outcomes would be extra. March 21 is already scheduled for next LTAC meeting, so that date works. We'll also schedule second session that morning, maybe on other side of campus, for non-LTAC folks who may wish to see the demo.
  - Lecture capture: New project manager identified, starts Mar. 12. She'll be guiding the fall pilot
- May Blackboard upgrade – Whitney Schultz
  - Phase 1 was July 2017 move to managed hosting. Phase 2 is the upgrade scheduled for May 19 (Commencement). Phase 3 would be full migration to SaaS / Ultra, but that would depend on the results of LMS review.
  - May 19 upgrade: no changes in the user interface (aside from logo update). Key feature enhancements are: in-line grading restored (video demo); drag-and-drop functionality for both students and instructors; submission receipts for assignments; report of submission history; send reminders to students who have not yet submitted assignments (video demo); additional Notifications available. (Slides provide additional information and links to videos.)
  - LTAC members (and others who may need it) can opt-in to gain access to the test environment between Feb 23-Mar 12. Email whitney.schultz@health.slu.edu with names, SLUnet IDs, and email addresses for anyone who should be added. Looking for feedback specifically on communication strategies and training needs. **Q:** what does opt-in trial include? **A:** Clone was created 2 wks ago, so whatever was in Bb at that time is what you'll see. **Q:** is there a way to identify the most frequent Bb users to offer this trial to? **A:** Not sure, we'll look into it. If we paid for Blackboard Analytics, we could see those use stats more easily.
  - Communication: We need to figure out the best way and timeline for getting this info out to faculty and students. Also will be some direct outreach to departments and programs, with offers of Bb support team to hold information sessions/trainings in academic units. Ideas? **A:** send out the demo videos. Send Newslink article. Send email. Students won't need a big communication

about these changes, since they probably won't even notice them. All need notification about the system outage that will happen on May 19.

- LMS Review/Developments- David Hakanson, Nancy Brickhouse
  - School of Medicine (SOM) felt the move to Canvas was a "do or die" situation related to accreditation. This was not well received, but we understand the need for accredited medical school. President Pestello felt it was important to let SOM proceed to Canvas, but this does not mean the rest of the University must move to Canvas.
  - LTAC's decision if you want to proceed with the review or pause for now and restart in the fall. Provost would like to see what happens in SOM; sales pitches often differ from implementation realities.
  - **Q**: If we do nothing, then what? **A**: We're essentially moving to a two LMS model. Bb is still the official LMS system of the University and we will continue to keep up with upgrades. **Q:** So then do we just proceed with upgrading to Bb Ultra? **A**: That's up to this committee; it might be something we should pilot. David's recommendation: wait and see what happens at SOM, pick up LMS review in the fall, reviewing Ultra, Canvas (with SOM's experience), and maybe Desire 2 Learn. As to whether we should be on one or two LMS's, about 40% of universities with a medical school have two LMSs, so it's about half and half. **Q**: How would this affect students who are taking courses from both schools? **A**: It's not ideal, but students would have to access different systems. **Q:** How much lead time would we need if we decided to all move to Canvas and what's the cost differential between the options? **A:** Cost differences between Canvas and Bb are minimal. Currently, the SOM is covering the Canvas costs, so if the whole University switches, that would relieve some cost for SOM, but doesn't make a difference to University at large. Time depends on how you plan the transition; ideal transition would take about a year, so making recommendation in Spring 2019, piloting in Fall 2019, and fully implementing in Spring 2020, with complete cut-off of Bb in Summer 2020 (assuming Bb is not the selection). **Q:** When is SOM starting Canvas? **A:** May. **Q**: How does the fast SOM process and a slow, deliberative process for the rest of the University work? These don't seem to match up. **A**: Accreditation has a way of expediting actions, even when not ideal. The SOM process is not the desired process for the University as a whole. Also, there was almost no use of Bb in School of Med, so adopting Canvas is much different for them versus the change it would be for the larger University. **Q**: Are other parts of the University going to be able to have access to Canvas while the School of Med is using it? **A:** If LTAC determines that's a part of its process, yes, but it's important for that access to be integrated into the process LTAC agrees on. **Q**: Do you foresee any other large IT decisions made in the next 18 months that LTAC will be forced to address while reviewing the LMS? **A**: Not really; possible replacement of Banner would start with HR and Financial systems; new catalog, new curriculum management software, new degree audit, and new advising systems are coming, but those systems lay over Banner (like Bb does). There aren't really LTAC implications for those.

- Other ITS changes – David Hakanson
  - On Friday, Newslink will announce final phase of IT transformation. Final cuts were made Feb 20. Does not affect Bb support or main Banner architect. Previous phases included: IT tier 1 phone support was outsourced to a division in Blackboard that specializes in that work, network support was outsourced, classroom support was moved to TSI, project management has been moved to a contract model.

- Help desk issues: IT has spent a lot of time working with Bb, especially at the beginning of the semester, to improve service. Working to reduce hold times, improve training, fixing our technologies. Getting ready to change ticketing system to reduce wrongly closed tickets and to issue surveys to assess quality. **Q**: Difficulty with classroom support, now that we don't have a person supporting classrooms in our bldg, there is no continuity of communication between areas (network, hardware, etc.). **A**: Great feedback; will look into improving and adding more communication. **Q**: In your metric about reduced hold times, does that figure in the possibility that people have stopped calling out of frustration? **A**: We don't have data that shows that call numbers have declined. But if people don't tell us what issues they're having, we can't fix them. It's important to use the process but let us know if your issue is not being addressed properly. **Q:** Is there an intention to retain a Mac specialist? **A**: All technicians should be trained in both. If you find someone who is not, let us know. **Q:** You talked about general help desk issues and the efforts to improve them, how are you thinking about the classroom support changes? **A**: We're also working to improve things there. We know hold times were too long, and we've worked to reduce those to 30 seconds. The TSI contract piece is working well, but where we still need to improve is that the call center people do not have the ability to do certain things remotely, such as restarting the Crestron control systems. We need to give them more access so that they can work things out. **Q**: A few faculty have called Bb about email issues and have been told to call Microsoft. **A**: This is incorrect information, next time report that to ITS.

Decisions / Recommendations Made: None

Learning Technologies Advisory Committee | Meeting Summary 3/21/18

<u>Attendees</u>:
Amy Bautz, Mamoun Benmamoun, Jiajing Chen, Robert Cole, Kyle Collins, Matt Grawitch, Stacey Harrington, Tim Howell, Lisieux Huelman, Craig Krausz, Mikael Kriz, Mike Lewis, Debie Lohe, Travis Loux, Stephen McMillin, Kyle Mitchell, Joseph Reznikov, Nathaniel Rivers, Steve Rogers, Mary Roman, Cindy Rubbelke

From Blackboard: Stacey White, Serge Varnov, Heather Woods

<u>**Decisions / Recommendations Made:**</u> None

<u>**Discussion Points:**</u>
- Approval of February minutes: motion to approve, Steven Rogers; second, Robert Cole.
- No discussion of informational items
- Blackboard representatives presented on the Goals tool (included in our current license and could be turned on now at no additional charge) and the Outcomes tool (which would require an additional license). Highlights from the presentation and discussion appear below. In general, there is likely interest in piloting Goals in one or two colleges/schools, but more discussion and analysis is needed to identify resource needs, processes, etc. that would be required to do so.

Blackboard Learn: Goals
- *Goals* is just the name of the tool; it's a neutral term to represent all different kinds of goals (outcomes, objectives, competencies, etc.) at all different levels (course, program, institution)
- Requires robust usage of Blackboard (e.g., instructors use Bb for all course assessments and link those assessments and other content to goals); applies to Organizations, not just Courses
- Enables you to structure data that allows you to report out on that information
- Starts with institutional decisions about structure/hierarchy for the *Goals Area* (highest-level; in the goals architecture), followed by cascading goals at different levels (categories, subgoals, etc.)
- Goals can be uploaded or manually entered; important for curriculum planning decisions to be made prior to starting, so the structure is built to support variety of uses by variety of stakeholders.
- To be useful, the Goals tool requires individual instructors to intentionally link/align goals (any of those levels) to "course content" / different types of assessments within a course (assignments, tests, specific test questions, journals, blogs, discussions, rubrics, specific rubric lines). Can link multiple goals, from multiple levels, to individual student assessment content. Can link goals to both graded and ungraded items, but ungraded items have more limited reporting options. Goals also may be linked/aligned to other kinds of content/tasks (e.g., watching a video, reading a chapter or piece of content, adding a reflection, completing an assessment of some sort that is not graded). Relatively easy to align content to goals; you can decide whether to show the goal alignment to students or not.
- Four different categories of reports in Bb, three of which we have access to now: Course Reports, Performance Dashboard, Retention Center [all three turned on currently], and Goal Performance Dashboard [would be turned on with Goals]
- In Course Reports, two reports draw from Goals data:
    - Course Coverage Report: (about your course) report card/assessment for instructor -- how well are you covering the goals you planned to cover? Shows which items align to which goals and the variety of types of assessments that align to the goal
    - Course Performance Report: (about your students) gives you information on how students are performing against the goals you have aligned to (compared to a specific threshold you set) -- some aggregate information about averages, but also student-by-student performance; can click on each student and learn more details

- In Goal Performance Dashboard: Can create an observer role that allows advisors/others to see certain types of information about students' performance against aligned goals in specific courses. Instructor can see reports on specific students' performance toward goals. Provides more nuanced perspective on student performance than just grades. For instance, if a student is getting Bs on everything, that doesn't tell them which things they are not achieving in vs. goals they are achieving / not. If you have a lot of students falling short on a specific goal, you can see that quickly and provide supplemental instruction
- If we moved to Goals, it would be important to make sure alignments are checked as part of the course archive function -- would have to do a full restore to get all of this information
- Program-level assessment is not easily facilitated in Goals (because Goals works on a course-level); all the data is there and you could export from courses and recombine into a single data set. Could be achieved via custom reports. [Note: This would be an important item to get additional clarity about if schools/colleges decide to move forward with adopting Goals.]
- If schools/colleges wanted to pilot Goals, we'd want to talk with Bb to get guidance on processes/next steps prior to turning on the tool. There is groundwork to be laid, and this will require additional resources and conversations and planning.

Blackboard Learn: Outcomes
- Builds on -- and assumes robust usage of – Goals tool; applies to Organizations, not just Courses
- Goal: to allow you to pull forward artifacts to look at in an aggregate way and evaluate those in a mass against a meta-level rubric; functions like a large magnet that pulls forward the goals/assessments into a separate repository (still within BbL, safe from course removal/course archiving functions).
- Can be set up and automated; students and instructors only do things once, in their courses
- Can pull "evidence"/artifacts for a specific institutional hierarchy/node, can pull for specific student/education level, term/date range. Also can pull artifacts of particular kinds, particular periods (before/after interventions or curriculum changes). Can random select a subset of the total collection of artifacts. Can look at breakouts to see assessment performance (against program/institution rubric) by gender, or other variables that are collected in / available to Bb
- The student artifacts come forward, with the assignment prompts and information, when submitted, etc. You can anonymize these (per collection) -- you "harvest" the artifacts, and can be anonymized later; you can select random samples from a set of artifacts
- You can assign evaluators to engage in evaluation sessions using a second-level (institution, programmatic) rubric; invite evaluators to log in and begin evaluating student work
- Important point: to assess the institution/program (not the student)
- If you use e-portfolios as a submission type, Outcomes can collect these (but they come in as a single "assignment")

General Points:
- These tools are ONLY as good as the data that goes into it; robust usage is needed. What drives Bb adoption? Pressure usually from students or from others at institution who need aggregate date
- Living artifacts, 3-D artifacts, etc. create a barrier (since you can't upload the actual artifacts)
- To facilitate adoption of Goals -- best to start with pockets where Bb is already robustly used
- Some Next Steps: readiness consulting to see where are we today, refine where we want to start, where our goals are, etc. [extra fees?]

Learning Technologies Advisory Committee | Meeting Summary April 18, 2018
Note: these minutes approved by electronic form on May 4, 2018; 15 approve, 2 abstain.

Attendees:
Benmamoun Mamoun, Jiajing Chen, Robert Cole, Kyle Collins, Jason Fritz, Matt Grawitch, Lisieux Huelman, Craig Krausz, Mikael Kriz, Mike Lewis, Debie Lohe, Travis Loux, Stephen McMillin, Chad Miller, Kyle Mitchell, Joseph Reznikov, Steve Rogers, Cindy Rubbelke. Guests: Neal Weber (SOM); Whitney Schultz (IT); and Angela Dean (IT).

Decisions / Recommendations Made:
- **LTAC will not meet in May.**

Meeting Summary:
- Approval of minutes:
    - Motion to approve: Steve Rogers, Robert Cole; all yay

- Informational updates
    - Should there be a May meeting? No.
    - Canvas shows up in MySLU tools for all faculty. Kyle will address with appropriate team. Goal will be to limit that item to just those users who have access to Canvas.

- LTAC Policy (Mike Lewis)- has been approved by the Provost and deans. Would like everyone to return next year, and then assign people to 1-, 2-, or 3-year terms to ensure a rolling membership.

- Academic Tech Commons (Mikael Kriz)- Innovative space and learning landscape. Three phase project for transforming spaces at SLU. Already become a model for other institutions. Includes equipment for checkout, and IMC services. Has been in heavy use from students, as well as faculty bringing in classes. Tracking room reservations; will begin tracking software usage frequency and foot traffic. A lightboard writing surface will be available this summer. Want faculty ideas and input. Please share any ideas.
    - Is there someone to help us use the recording studio? Yes. When you reserve the space, someone will give a quick 5-minute overview for how to use the equipment, and there is always someone there during business hours.
    - Website for ATC doesn't do it justice. It's a marketing gap and an information gap. The library website also doesn't do justice to all the resources they have. Response: Marcom didn't want to devote website space/time to these pages until after the CMS migration completes.

- Blackboard upgrade (Whitney Schultz)- May 19th. Planning a roadshow to visit different bldgs. across campus to set up and show people how to navigate the changes. The plan is for outage late Friday night-Sunday afternoon that weekend. Planning on posting dates of roadshow on Newslink. Also will be highlighting new Bb uses on Newslink monthly. Communication of the outage will be done through Newslink, a system-wide announcement in Blackboard, and a direct email outreach to instructors assigned to courses that begin on Monday, May 21.

- Lecture Capture Replacement project (Angela Dean)- New project manager on Panopto project. Update: We want to work w/ this committee to identify faculty to participate in the pilot. Need 10-20 (or more)

people to set up in classroom, adding content, do the training, and do a survey for the fall semester. Ideally 1-2 faculty from each college. (Timeline attached below). Goal: to make a recommendation to CADD at their November meeting.

- o Online & face-to-face courses for pilot? Yes, want to cover all.
- o We should go back to the Yuja piloters to see if they'd like to pilot again
- o Details about training? July is anticipated, but we're still figuring out the details on the training. Want to make sure there's enough time before fall semester. Virtual or in-person training? Not sure yet.
- o If we go with Panopto and we have existing Tegrity videos, what's the transition on those? Conversion will be part of our contract, but quality may be an issue. Need to pilot/test.
- o Does Panopto integrate w/ Bb better than Tegrity? We believe so.

- Blackboard Goals and Outcomes- Next steps for piloting? Several schools /colleges interested. Kyle and Debie will pull a group together to identify what's needed and whether a pilot is feasible. Plan to deal with just Goals first, and see how that goes before considering Outcomes.

- Other Teaching & Learning Technology Issues/Topics- LTAC Members
- o Email issues (Kyle will pass along) Junk mail is pervasive. Watch out for Bb emails going to Junk
- o Last year we had a discussion about building blocks for Bb for various integrations. Would like to create a vetting process through this group for what things we do and don't add as Bb integrations. Debie and Kyle to draft process this summer for LTAC to see in early fall.
- o Online secure exam software? Some deans already working together on that, because LTAC couldn't tackle this year. Examsoft is currently in use by some schools.
- o Audience response systems? It's on our list of things to tackle in the future.

- Meeting closed with Debie and Kyle thanking the committee for their service this year.