Learning and Research Technology Workgroup
Meeting Notes
April 26, 2019
Education, Building 02, Room 024 at 9:10 – 10am

Present: Sean Hurley, Chairperson, CAFES
         Cesar Torres Bustamante, CAED
         Scott Hazelwood, CENG
         Jennifer Klay, CSM
         Jeff Nadel, CENG
         Patrick O’Sullivan, CTLT
         Bruno Ribeiro, CLA
         Peter Schlosser, CLA, Academic Senate
         Patricia McQuaid, OCOB
         Alison Robinson, AVP for ITS
         Jesse Vestermark, Kennedy Library
         Gregory Scott, CSM
         Kathryn Hammer, ITS

Guests: Mary Pedersen, AA
         Peter Schuster, CENG
         Teresa Cameron, OCOB
         Solina Lindahl, OCOB
         Tonia Malone, CTLT

Absent: Catherine Hillman, CTLT
        Thomas Gutierrez, Physics Dept
        Andres Martinez, CSM

I. Learning Management System
Sean Hurley welcomed the group. Introductions for members and guests. Today’s topic is to discuss Learning Management System (LMS).

Alison Robinson shared background about the topic over this academic year. Cal Poly’s move to Amazon Web Services (AWS) has raised the question, “Is the work we need to do to move Moodle to AWS the best use of time to position Cal Poly for the future or would our effort and future be better served implementing a new Learning Management System?” From that, a dialog has surfaced to explore continuing with Moodle or moving to Canvas. Additionally, the student governance group, SC3, has been discussing mobile applications and students expressed a desire for the LMS to be mobile. ASI funded a student success project to unify and modernize the campus mobile app and have expressed desire for an LMS that functions on mobile devices. SC3 and ASI have joined the dialog concerning a new LMS.

Mary Pedersen opened up discussion about the main issues: 1) What are the LMS options? 2) What are the costs to maintain PolyLearn vs. moving to a new platform? 3) What is the timeline and how will faculty be impacted?

Tonia Malone shared research from CSU Humboldt, CSU Los Angeles, and CSU San Marcos. Data concerning the various CSU campuses and the LMS’ they use tracked and shared within the CSU. There was discussion concerning the information that was shared and it was also noted that the information was from 2016 and that there was likely updated information to considered.
There was a discussion about costs. Data from Alison’s research of CSU invoices for Canvas indicates an average cost of $8.30/student. Remove the high and low costs from that data and the average cost is $8.60/student. CSU is looking at piggybacking on the contract between California Community Colleges and Canvas to gain economies of scale and simplify the procurement process. Further exploration of one-time and on-going costs will occur.

Discussion about decision factors for a LMS. Need to consider if a LMS is flexible enough to serve all pedagogical needs and will it get used. Other important factors include:
- Ability to be used on mobile devices
- Accessibility
- Ability to integrate open learning resources
- Plug and play
- Scalability to serve a large population
- Faculty and Student experience and how they encounter material
- Cost

Discussion about timeline. Based on significant technical debt, and software and hardware that are coming to end-of-life, the LMS needs to be relocated within 18 months. Two options are on the table: 1) move PolyLearn to AWS, or 2) implement a new LMS in AWS. Mary recommended that various levels of support can be developed to utilize many resources to support faculty during the transition.

Question about privacy clause in Instructure in which Instructure has rights to the content that’s posted on Canvas. Tonia shared that CSU Humboldt was successful in changing their contract with Instructure to retain intellectual property rights with the campus and instructors. Alison indicated that a contract would never be signed with those terms in the contract.

Discussion about timeline. A new LMS roll-out would be either a hard date cut over or phased approach. Need to consider cost and user experience with each. A proposed timeline and support structures would be developed as part of the discovery phase. Student response has been that they want course materials to placed consistently in the LMS.

Campus must work to efficiently determine whether to move Moodle or move to a new LMS in order to create the best transition experience for faculty and students.

**Action Items:**
1. Workgroup Members: Find out from Faculty in which quarter do they prefer to start in a LMS in AWS (Fall, Winter, Spring), and how much overlap with on-prem LMS, if any, is preferred?