
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: JULIAN LOMBARDI – ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT, DUKE UNIVERSITY OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

FROM: EDWARD GOMES - ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR TRINITY COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES AND CHAIR OF ELEARNING ROADMAP COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: ELEARNING ROADMAP COMMITTEE MAY REPORT

DATE: 6/1/2010

This report provides a status update of activities, collective documentation and planning of the eLearning Roadmap Committee. Detailed information is available on the [eLearning web site](#).

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

During fall 2009 and spring 2010 the eLearning Roadmap Group focused its energies on investigations related to the Learning Management System environment, with the intent to identify future directions for Duke after the current Blackboard 8 contract expires in June 2012. The eLearning Roadmap Group gathered data and feedback about teaching needs and LMS products, and narrowed our scope of investigation to three potential LMS products: Blackboard 9.x, Moodle and Sakai. Moodle and Sakai are both community/open source software, while Blackboard is a corporate/proprietary product. At this time we are not actively pursuing investigations of other models of course or learning management software, such as a "best of breed" model, but are continuing to keep an eye on the developing landscape. We continue to work toward improving our understanding of whether a "best of breed" model could support the functional, technical and strategic needs at Duke. We also are aware that no single LMS system will support all the identified teaching needs; other integrated tools will be needed and are in-scope for the eLearning Roadmap Group to recommend at a future time.

The eLearning Roadmap Group work included (reports posted at eLearning.duke.edu):

- communications with various administrative and faculty groups on campus ([eLearning events](#))
- developing a statement of principles about our investigations ([eLearning Guiding Principles](#))
- conducting faculty interviews ([eLearning User Profiles](#), [Common eLearning Practices at Duke](#))
- summarizing some functional needs for the Duke eLearning environment ([eLearning Functional Requirements](#))
- reviewing LMS use at our peer institutions ([LMS Review](#))
- conducting full-day demos of the three competing LMS products.

Feedback on the functionality from the demos, analysis of other peer institution investigations and exploration of LMS documentation did not support eliminating any of the three systems from contention at this time.

KEY QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

The key remaining questions have been divided into four categories for further investigation this summer: functional, technical, strategic and cost analysis. Sub-groups of the eLearning Roadmap Group, including several faculty, have been tasked with detailed investigations in each of these areas and will be actively working and reporting back. In addition some over-arching questions have been identified which cross more than one of these subgroups:

- There is significant concern on the part of faculty about content migration from the existing LMS; investigations of the migration process will be central to our summer work and we are aware that there may potentially need to be a significant effort to migrate content to a different LMS solution.
- There are concerns about the public/private nature of the material maintained in the LMS. This issue will need to be addressed, driven by the use cases and strategic direction of both instruction and research.
- The ability to integrate functionality that isn't native to the LMS is very important (lecture capture, library resources, multi-media, etc).
- The ability to easily allow non-Duke community members, overseas partners and others to collaborate with faculty and students in our LMS is a growing strategic need. This requirement has implications for both LMS functionality and administration, as well as institutional policies on Duke affiliate account generation and system access.

TIMELINE OF SUMMER AND EARLY FALL ACTIVITY

Our eLearning subgroups will investigate and report on their assigned areas during early and middle summer, generating a recommendation from within their areas by mid-August. Communication on many levels through various methods will be continued to keep the Duke community apprised of the status. Faculty outreach and integration into the group activities is a key component of this process with significant ramp up in the August - October time frame (see attached timeline). To that end, we have a number of faculty who have volunteered to participate in subgroup activity as well as drop-in activities sponsored by the committee. The recommendations of the working subgroups, along with feedback from other sources, will be developed into a draft summary recommendation by the beginning of September.

FALL RECOMMENDATION

The draft recommendation will be vetted at various faculty meetings in early October. Any recommended changes based on feedback will be incorporated prior to final approval. By the end of October, the final recommendation will be submitted to Julian Lombardi who will review the document and submit it to Peter Lange, Tallman Trask and Tracy Futhey (Senior Leadership). The CIO, the Provost and the Executive Vice President will review the recommendation and will make a final decision in consultation with the deans and faculty leadership.