

## 12 June 2003: CMSAG Summary

In attendance: Joe Burley, Erin Easterling, Randy Graff, John Holmes, Doug Johnson, Kris Kirmse, Terry Morrow, Ron Thomas, marvel Townsend, Martin Vala, Mike Wright.

### I. Opening Comments and Discussion:

Doug reiterated the process for absentee voting: That he will send out an email this week to which absentee voters should respond by selecting "Reply to All" and unequivocally indicating their recommendation choice.

It was suggested that each individual who wishes to do so should be allowed to explain his or her vote and that those explanations be included in the committee's report. This suggestion was approved, so members are asked to put their vote and rationales in writing to be presented at the next meeting. Doug asked that all members send to him digital copies of the text they wish to go into the final report regarding their voting decision.

#### *Critical Dates:*

- Voting by email is now open. The official vote will be tallied at the 19 June meeting.

### II. Migration Support:

Doug passed out a "[Migration Support Continuum](#)" document for the committee to use to guide discussion regarding the level of migration support we would recommend be provided by the central support unit.

Using this model, it was the committee's recommendation was to offer faculty a choice of levels of migration support. The committee agreed that the "default" support option should be "Moderate Support" with "No Support," "Minimum Support," and "Systematic Support" as additional options. Because there were no additional support implications for No Support and Minimum Support options, discussion revolved primarily around the Systematic Support and Turn-Key Support options. It was the consensus of the committee that Turn-Key support was not desirable because leaving faculty out of the migration process was unlikely to prepare them to effectively make use of the new CMS. The committee also agreed that the Systematic Support option should be available to faculty at their choice.

The committee recognized that making the Systematic Support option available to faculty will be relatively expensive. Therefore, the committee discussed possible corollary policies such as requiring faculty choosing Systematic Support to attend training classes before scheduling their "migration consultation" or perhaps paying a nominal fee to recover some of the costs of this option. However, no consensus was found for either of these policies. Where consensus was found was in the assertion that current CMS users, having served as a technological vanguard for the University, should be given additional support to avoid requiring them to rebuilt courses in which significant time an effort has already been invested.

### III. CMS Recommendation

One question that has floated around the committee is the extent to which current faculty users of WebCT are actually making use of features and functions that would require Blackboard Building Blocks to achieve the same level of functionality. To address this question, Doug sent to the WebCT Users list questions about current and desired future use of such features [appended], receiving the following feedback:

Feature	Current Use		Future Use	
	N	%	N	%
WebCT internal email	30	70%	30	70%
Calculated questions in quizzes	15	35%	26	60%
Random variables in calculated questions	8	18%	20	46%
Selective release by mastery criteria	3	7%	20	46%
Selective release by student name	19	44%	25	58%
None of the Above	4	9%	4	9%
<b>N = 43</b>				

These data indicate that the level of use of these features and functions may be significantly higher than is often assumed by the committee. This data also reiterates the necessity of licensing the series of relevant Building Blocks should the University's decision be to go with Blackboard.

#### **IV. Report Writing**

##### *Work Group Leaders:*

Yet another reminder that each work group leader should be writing a brief report to present the information and recommendations developed under his or her auspices.

##### *Recommendation and Planning Draft:*

Please devote adequate time to read and offer suggestions on how to continue developing the final document.

#### **V. Next Meetings [tentative topics]:**

Thursday, 19 June 2003. 9:30 AM, Turlington 1012 ***[Final discussions, Recommendation decision]***

Thursday, 26 June 2003. 9:30 AM, Turlington 1012 ***[Report writing]***

Thursday, 03 July 2003. 9:30 AM, Turlington 1012 ***[Report writing]***

#### **ADDENDUM: Report Submission Process:**

1. The committee report document will be delivered to Dr. Fedro Zazueta as the Director who commissioned the committee and detailed its mandate.
2. Dr. Zazueta will consult with Dr. Charles Frazier, Vice Provost for Information Technology about the report and its recommendations.
3. Zazueta and Frazier will return to the committee suggested modifications to the report.
4. The committee will make the modifications and return the report for additional consideration.
5. Upon approval, the committee will present the final report to the UF ITAC committee.
6. The ITAC Committee will decide what recommendations to forward to the Provost for final decision making.

## WEBCT FEATURES

### The questions as posed:

Greetings all!

As you are aware, there is a committee working to make a recommendation of a single course management system to be centrally supported at UF. The committee is currently attempting to evaluate certain specific features and functions that may be needed and/or desired by faculty. Therefore, I would very much appreciate feedback from as many of you as possible regarding the following questions:

1. Which of the following features of WebCT do you use?

- A. WebCT internal email no
- B. Calculated questions in quizzes yes
- C. Random variables in calculated questions no
- D. Selective release by mastery criteria (e.g. students cannot access module 2 until scoring 80%+ on module 1 quiz) yes
- E. Selective release by student name yes

2. Which of those features do you think you might use in the future?

- A. WebCT internal email no-> there are already class listservs provided by UF
- B. Calculated questions in quizzes yes
- C. Random variables in calculated questions yes
- D. Selective release by mastery criteria yes
- E. Selective release by student name yes

Any additional comments about how useful you consider these features or how you use these features will be greatly appreciated.

## User Responses:

Feature	Current Use	Future Use
WebCT internal email	30	30
Calculated questions in quizzes	15	26
Random variables in calculated questions	8	20
Selective release by mastery criteria	3	20
Selective release by student name	19	25
None of the Above	4	4
<b>N = 43</b>		

Additional comments re. usefulness / how you use these features.

- For the record, I use E so that I can have students in my class read each other's term papers. I post all the submitted term papers electronically on the WebCT page, and configure it so that each paper is accessible to three student "readers" (chosen by me). Students then submit their reviews to me by WebCT email. This selective release was a pain in the neck to set up, but it was well worth the effort.
- Calculated questions in quizzes comprise 90% of my quizzes and are indispensable. Random variables in calculated questions allow me to accept repeated attempts on quizzes AND releasing the grade and correct answer on each attempt. Sometimes the 'reverse engineering' of a problem teaches them the concept!
- I use A and E. I don't know what B or C or D are but now that I see them, I may look further into using them
- I just got into managing a course this semester and am looking forward to using this medium to its fullest.
- Releasing the quiz based on the student's name is very helpful. Otherwise, it would not be possible to allow students to makeup quizzes.
- For myself and others in physics, the most important of these features are B. calculated questions in quizzes and C. Random variables in calculations. I and others in our department are presently using these and intend to continue using these.
- Continue to develop use of WebCT. I seem to use more each semester. The more features available, the better.
- "D. Selective release by mastery criteria (e.g. students cannot access module 2 until scoring 80%+ on module 1 quiz)" <-LOVE IT!