

Budget and Planning Committee Agenda

Thursday, October 31st, 2019
10:00 –11:30 AM

Student Health Center, Conference Room (HCCR)

I. Call to order: 10:02am

- Attendees: B. Street, D. Jackson, C. Lam, J. Millar, J. Woods, J. Choi, A. Wan, A. Hegde, A. Grombly, D. Cantrell, M. Quarles, L. Lara, J. Stark, S. Gamboa, A. Lauer, A. Anderson, V. Harper, M. Martinez, C. Cullen, J. Lords, S. Saner, Y. Monores, F. Gorham, R. Esparza

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes – 10/17/19: L. Lara, A. Hegde 2nd, passed

III. Announcements

- Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas joint meeting AS&SS and BPC – **time certain 10:15 AM – 10:55 AM**
 - Discussion of the format of the report; there are still surveys out for the fourth term; costs are known
 - \$83k for base Blackboard
 - \$110k for Canvas
 - ASI resolution supporting Canvas migration
 - Stronger mobile app on Canvas than Blackboard
 - Apple and Android user data indicate high ratings from users
 - Engagement: 4500 students using Canvas, all of the CC use Canvas, KHSD online program, 8 CSU, 7 UC, and most R1 institutions all use Canvas
 - We can rely on existing add-in and augmentation from other institutions and users because they have a developed ecosystem
 - Not currently paying for Blackboard support
 - Want 24/7 support

- ii. Need incident, regular support, and faculty support
- iii. Will still have 2 staff in FTLC
 - 1. Have peer support for the instructional aspect
- iv. Review of the type of support we are looking for as opposed to when the Helpdesk is currently available to provide support
 - 1. 107 request for assistance
 - a. MG can provide further breakdown of the requests for support
- v. Should CSUB migrate to a new LMS?
 - 1. Looked at Sac State and CSUCI and followed their models to develop CSUB survey and timeline
 - 2. Faculty Course Creation Survey:
 - a. Was it created from scratch or migrated?
 - i. How easy it was to use?
 - ii. Predominant preference for Canvas
 - b. How easy was it to use over the course of the term?
 - 3. Student Learning Survey
 - a. Preference for Canvas
- vi. Pros v. Cons
 - 1. It is more expensive
 - 2. A few faculty had issues with organizing their courses
 - a. We have instructional support and sister campuses to provide guidance
 - 3. Some of our students are familiar with Blackboard, but we have a population of transfer students already familiar with Canvas, and freshman are able to adapt
 - 4. Canvas was built to be web-based, the APIs they offer are all web-based, and we can push/pull data without having to use individual files.

- a. Blackboard still relies on file uploads and downloads, but they are slowly moving web-based
- 5. Cost of support is a difference between \$21k and \$9k
 - a. Costs to integrate Helpdesk
 - b. Costs for faculty support
- 6. Concern about moving into a monopoly with Canvas and we are at the mercy of the vendor for cost increases, etc.
 - a. Procurement: we negotiate for a 5 year contract at fixed increases; after 5 years, we have to release a new RFP. We can use extensions for up to 2 years.
 - i. You might get 8-9 years out of a contract and it has to be addressed anyway
 - b. Alternative is to go with an open source:
 - i. Sakai (sp?), Moodle
 - ii. You have to host and support it; UC Merced had a 5 person support team with a consortium.
 - iii. These types of consortium are starting to shrink
 - c. The ecosystem is matters because there are other people to rely upon
 - d. CO negotiated with Blackboard, Canvas, and Desire to Learn and they have existing contracts. They all end this year.
 - i. This summer the CO renegotiated the Canvas contract
 - ii. In October, the CO negotiated the Blackboard contract

- e. With regards to the decision-making process: the affects the learning process, and there are two groups who need to be consulted
 - i. Support: 24/7 is available for Blackboard, but is the Canvas 24/7 hosted or local? It depends on how ITS integrates the Canvas support with the existing helpdesk. It will likely be Canvas for troubleshooting
 - ii. Course creation will be automated so long as sections do not need to be combined; combined sections will route to FTLC
 - iii. If multiple campuses are on Canvas, and we advocate for an open source, can we use that as leverage to negotiate to reduce the price?
 1. CO uses that leverage already
 2. Canvas and Blackboard are using FTES by IPEDS reporting; at some point, we may be able to move to a centralized model like the community colleges.
 - iv. PR issue: emphasis on Canvas rather than an actual comparison between Blackboard and Canvas. May need more additional information on Blackboard to make this more equitable, but right now it feels like the move to Canvas is a foregone conclusion. It needs to be more

evident that this is an analysis between the two platforms

1. This is just an evaluation of the Canvas pilot. The benefit for IT is clear, but the survey data is to reflect the benefit to students and faculty
- v. 8 CSUs on Canvas and 2 piloting
- vi. Desire to Learn (D2L): because none of the community colleges are using it, it was not considered as an option. Some of our lecturers and other faculty are already using Canvas elsewhere. D2L is comparable in price.
- vii. Migration timeline and support: in the report Spring 2021 is the timeline listed. Blackboard contract ends June 2021 unless we file extensions. Migration within one term appears doable based upon other campus timelines. With three terms, CSUB should be able to migrate.
 1. Support for individuals who may need support. Are there one-time funds allocated to help faculty migrate content in the migration.
 - a. 2 Instructional designers and one additional staff member from IT. Seems comparable to other campuses

- b. Opportunity for staff and faculty well versed in Canvas to engage with helping faculty in the migration?
- viii. Survey data: is it representative of the larger body
 - 1. More of the technologically inclined users are likely to use the newer technology
 - 2. 11% of the faculty are responding and 14% of the overall students responded; there are issues with making decisions on data that only represents such a small part of the campus community
 - 3. How do we address issues related to the users who are not already represented in the survey data?
 - a. We can only go with the data that we have
 - b. Conversion: all Blackboard courses were migrated to Canvas and faculty were asked to review them; there were more people who responded after the report was issued.

- c. Faculty who only use Blackboard who are not piloting Canvas (502 faculty):
 - i. Only 93 responded, but they reported satisfaction with Blackboard, but they also expressed interested in trying a new LMS.
- ix. When we transitioned from WebCT to Blackboard, we had more comparisons of features though we didn't have pilots
 - 1. There are features that have been lost from Blackboard
 - 2. Can we get a fair comparison of the features in Bb, Canvas, and other LMS? What if we just bolstered Bb?
 - a. This data is available with rankings
 - 3. The auto-enroll feature is also not a selling point
- f. Google Classroom is not an enterprise level product; it works well with K-12, but it is not something we can use for most of instruction. It is a specific tool to support Teacher Ed.

- g. Are there templates or example courses that show content that migrated because not all of it migrated well
 - i. What about a straight migration to Canvas, a manipulated course that was migrated, etc? Can we have cases posted to the FTLC webpage with content and without?
- h. Testing tool is “better”, but it is different than what we have before. It does link with Turnitin.
- i. Students seem adaptable: anecdotal evidence and attitudes from students is that it is difficult to move from one to the other, but once they migrate, it is not much of an issue. It was likened to the changing between OS on a phone.
- j. Discussion of assessing the tools available and whether they meet the needs of the faculty and students. One of the major issues is the time to assess them with faculty. Further discussion of cost for special tools to integrate additional features.
- k. Is there something we will have to give up to afford the extra cost of the new LMS?
 - i. Information Technology Roadmap for CSUB: assess needs for campus and then those go on the roadmap, and it goes to ITAC for confirmation, then the budget request goes to cabinet for review
 - ii. We have saved money on another tool, and that money may be allocated to either the base license to Canvas plus

24/7 support. IT does not currently know the costs to accommodate changes to Bb to provide the same level of support

- l. Discussion of process for consulting CSUB constituencies. Surveys were the primary source for the report, but now Senate is being consulted in addition to other groups.
- m. ASI resolution for support of Canvas: 66% of student buy-in isn't significant, but ASI did discuss the issue with relation to GI 2025 and transfer students. Most of the transfer students know about Canvas, but not as many freshmen. Students are adaptable, and Bb is not useful as a mobile app and limiting based upon OS. It is not efficient, but Canvas is. Informal surveying of students in Canvas pilot indicated that they preferred Canvas. Discussion of the survey data in considering the resolution and availability of 24/7 support.
- n. There still needs to be a comparison between Canvas and Bb even if it just shows what Bb has (or doesn't have) so there is information about it. Also might be a good idea to let faculty know that the courses have been migrated.
- o. Selection bias: is it possible to do a qualitative analysis or mixed methods rather than just survey data. Students don't seem to care about the migration so much as the content. Students are and need to be adaptable. Professionally, we all have to adapt to different environments.

- i. IT has reviewed the comments in the survey and grouped them to identify some of the issues. Are there strong feelings amongst the non-responders?
- p. What is the fundamental reason we tried to move to Canvas? Is there any way to fix the existing issues? Who wants to use the mobile device?
 - i. Bb has difficulties in changing their technology around. Students do want to use their mobile devices to submit their work and access course content.
 - ii. The Bb business model isn't adapting to these changes.
- q. We should go with what the students concern, but the way this change was introduced to faculty and students is cause for concern. There is also a business concern with conflict of interest from the advocates at the CO. Though there are three products that have been approved at the CO.
 - i. Current costs have already probably accumulated 300-400 hours
 - ii. There is shared governance in ITC to initiate this, and it went through ITAC and other groups that made this decision
- r. Students and mobile app are important, but business can bounce back. We do need to see a comparison of the two products. It changes the dialogue and provides Senate the ability to make a decision. IT can pull the data possibly from

other campus' RFPs; the data is three years old, but it should address the issue.

- i. We would have avoided this meeting if we had the comparison before
- s. Rumor about Bb being acquired by Canvas cannot be verified.
- t. Request information on campuses using Canvas to address student concerns for graduate programs
- u. Student success: we can review the percentage of students enrolled and where the grade distribution is. We can intervene and provide services. We can target those students.
Discussion also of faculty adoption
- v. Still need to include AAC in the discussion.

What are the next steps:

- i. Need to bring Charlene in for her perspective
- ii. Other faculty quoted in the report might offer useful perspective
- iii. We need the one-to-one perspective
- iv. There is an issue with finding fundamental faults with either system.
There are a lot more concerns with the process than with the products.
- v. Wait for the comparison before we move forward.
 - 1. Discussion of issues that push Canvas in terms of student compatibility
 - 2. Discussion of hours invested

3. Faculty buy-in: pre-emption of problems that may come up; what can we do to prepare for migration and issues we can prepare users for
4. Discussion of splitting the referral: there is not timetable. We can work through this as we see fit. The Bb contract is not up until 2021. Dates on the contract have changed since the report was issue, but there is no timeline, irrespective of the contract. Discussion of the recommendation of IT versus faculty.
5. B. Street to work with J. Millar, and M. Danforth on making faculty more aware of the migrations to Canvas to review content; need for comparison of features
6. Discussion of the beginning of the process and the perception it creates. V. Harper asserts there is not a predetermined outcome and the existing deadlines were not supportive of shared governance, so there is no deadline to make this decision.

- vi. There has been a lot of funding expended to make this decision, and how much is allocated for these discussions? Is this wasteful at this point to pursue additional information at additional cost? Trying to get this train back on track, and it will be tracked by V. Harper to make sure there is robust deliberation on the issue and we do not omit something else from our plans to accommodate this deliberation.
- vii. Discussion of the use of mobile devices as opposed to laptops. Need to discuss mobile and computer incompatibilities with IT for follow up by AS&SS and Senate Exec.

IV. Approval of Agenda

V. Old Business

1. Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology
 - a. Discussion of how the resolution will be developed with AAC
 - b. Does BPS have additional questions or concerns for the resolution of support?
2. Referral 07 Academic Calendar
 - a. B. Street has received the draft with one outstanding issue related to commencement
 - b. Also need to ensure that 180 instruction days are included and the days per class are accommodated
3. Campus Budget and IRPA data discussion
4. Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas

VI. New Business

1. Referral 20 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering Emphasis within the B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering

VII. Open Forum (time certain 11:15)

VIII. Adjourn