In the spring 2015 semester, the University of Wisconsin-Madison piloted the Canvas learning management system (LMS) across five different courses (ranging from face-to-face, to blended, to fully online) with five different instructors and engaged 188 unique students.

This evaluation was designed to assess the first-stage of UW-Madison’s exploration of Canvas and to determine considerations for implementing the LMS campus-wide. To this end, faculty and students participating in the pilot were surveyed regarding their direct perceptions and experience with Canvas. Additionally, feedback was collected from individuals who work to support and extend the existing LMSs on campus.

Based on the data that was gathered, a resounding student voice came through: students only want one LMS on campus. Of the 105 students who responded to the survey, 70% agreed that the same LMS should be used campus-wide by all courses and instructors. This finding corresponds with the response of student participants in the 2013 Canvas pilot conducted by the Wisconsin School of Business.

Although students in this evaluation reported that the core features of Canvas were not distinctly different than other LMSs, the largest percentage of respondents (42%) said they favored Canvas when asked directly about which system they preferred – an opinion largely based on “clean layout” and “ease-of-use.” Further, 49% of students indicated that Canvas was better at helping them engage with the course material than other LMSs.

These data resembled those collected from the faculty participants, all of which emphasized the “ease” and “simplicity” of using Canvas. However, despite their general, favorable response, most faculty participants had varied qualifications/issues that would need to be resolved before they would recommend a campus-wide adoption of Canvas.

Given the positive responses about Canvas’ design and usability; the strong student desire for one, universal LMS on campus; as well as the potential for long-term cost savings with Canvas, we believe the data is compelling enough to warrant further exploration in this space. Additionally, as it relates to opportunities through the Unizin Consortium, we believe the data supports continued exploration of Canvas as a possible campus-wide LMS. While the pilot was initially launched to specifically explore and assess the Canvas LMS, it also subsequently pushed the university to take a closer look at its broader infrastructure. As a result, the pilot provided a fresh lens to capture important insights on the inner workings and complexities of our current operating systems. Moreover, and especially with the looming D2L contract expiration, the pilot provided the opportunity to explore and consider the best options for the current and future needs of our faculty, staff and students, and ultimately to shape and support the university’s next generation digital learning environment.

Inspire students. Enrich learning.
edinnovation.wisc.edu
In the spring 2015 semester, the University of Wisconsin-Madison piloted the Canvas Learning Management System (LMS) across five different classes (ranging from face-to-face, to blended, to fully online) with five different instructors, and testing Canvas with 188 unique students. The goal of this evaluation was to provide a high-level overview of student and staff experience of Canvas in order to better inform decisions and conversations across campus. To this end, faculty interviews and student experience survey data were collected. Additionally, concerns and issues that were raised by individuals working to support and extend the existing LMSs on campus were also collected.

Consequently, the report has two broad sections:

1. The first section highlights experiences and perceptions from faculty and students. Faculty were prompted for feedback throughout the spring 2015 semester and interviewed at the conclusion of the semester. Students in the Canvas pilot classes were surveyed at the end of the semester. Overall, this section is information from expected groups involved in the evaluation of a new classroom technology on campus.

2. The second section is perhaps less typical in a report of this nature, but emerged as a perspective that provided important information on the broader context of Canvas-use and adoption across campus. This section organizes feedback from instructional technologists from across the UW-Madison campus.
In the spring of 2015 semester, the University of Wisconsin-Madison piloted the Canvas LMS across five different classes (ranging from face-to-face, to blended, to fully online) with five different instructors and 188 unique students. 105 students completed the end-of-semester survey for a 56% response rate.

This section of the report focuses on the outcomes from the end-of-semester assessment of the spring 2015 Canvas courses that was adapted from previous UW assessments of Canvas (see left). The key findings from the student and faculty during the current Canvas assessment were as follows:

- As with the WSOB pilot a significant percentage of students (66%) indicated that they found the use of multiple LMSs on campus “annoying.”
- Canvas had an impact in a few areas for students (intuitive to learn, increased engagement with course content) but across the majority of measured dimensions, students see no difference between Canvas and other LMSs they have experience with (mainly D2L and Moodle). For students, if an LMS has a core set of features (e.g., a mobile interface and communication aids) it is viewed positively.
- Lastly, and somewhat contradicting the previous point 42% of surveyed students indicated they prefer Canvas as an LMS system—an opinion based largely on the “clean layout” and “ease of use” of Canvas.
- All the faculty appreciated the “ease” and “simplicity” of using Canvas, but most of the faculty had specific functional needs/issues that need to be resolved before they would recommend Canvas be adopted across campus.

Previous UW Examination of Canvas

In 2013, the Wisconsin School of Business (WSOB) at UW-Madison conducted a limited pilot of Canvas. The key finding was that students overwhelmingly wanted a single LMS across campus. Even though students liked Canvas, they did not want another LMS added into the UW ecosystem.

In 2014, UW System conducted a limited test across a few campuses that indicated support for Canvas from students, however not as strong as what was found in the WSOB pilot.
Students remain concerned over the number of different LMSs being used across campus

Overall Statistics
Canvas Pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th># of courses offered in Canvas at UW-Madison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Unique # of instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Unique # of students. If one user is a student in 2 courses, the statistic will count as 1 student.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th># of assignments submitted to courses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Files Uploaded</th>
<th># of files uploaded to Canvas (Note: Does not include deleted files)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDENTS**

Students who participated in the end-of-course survey represented a variety of majors, as well as a variety of years in school. The majority (87%) expected to receive an A or AB in the course (which helps to control for perceptual issues of an LMS that could be associated with an expected grade). And most used Chrome as a preferred browser. Preferred browser was a slight predictor of Canvas satisfaction in the WSOB pilot, but not in this examination. In fact, none of these demographic factors influenced the perception of Canvas (See Appendix 1).

As in the previous assessment at WSOB, the plurality of responses indicate a desire for one LMS on campus. 70% of students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “The same LMS should be used campus-wide by all classes and instructors.” Further, 66% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the use of so many LMSs on campus was “annoying”, and 60% expressed frustration over the use of different LMSs across campus.

There also appears to be a core set of features most student desire in an LMS: (1) students want the LMS to work on their mobile device, (2) students want the LMS to help foster communication with an instructor, and (3) students want it to help with communication to other students in the class. Just as was discovered in the WSOB pilot, students did not have any interest in an LMS that integrated with Facebook or LinkedIn. This
reinforces other research that suggests that most students prefer a strong “firewall” between their campus-life and their off-campus-life.

The heart of the evaluation is in what ways students viewed Canvas as helping or hurting their academic achievement. Students were asked about a series of dimensions that other LMS assessments have used in one form or another. In some cases these impact questions were crafted from impacts Canvas itself purported.

Figure 1 lists these impacts, and provides the percentage of participants who indicated that there was no difference between Canvas and other LMSs (mainly D2L and Moodle) that students previously used across campus.

From this view Canvas has some positive aspects: (1) it was considered easy-to-learn, and (2) 49% of students indicated that Canvas was better at helping them engage with the course material than other LMSs.

This is encouraging and mirrors what many of the faculty reported. However, it is also important to point out that across MOST of these dimensions, students see no difference across other LMSs they have experienced.

**FIGURE 1: Student Rating of Canvas Relative to other LMSs**

**FIGURE NOTE:** Canvas seems to have a slight edge in being easy-to-learn, and with increasing engagement with content. However, in most respects Canvas is not seen any differently from other LMSs that students have used. Line noted at 50% “no difference.”
Within the top three activities students performed in Canvas, #1 Checking Grades – 95%; #2 Downloading Course Material – 94%; and #3 Submitting Class Assignments – 88%, the percentage of problems experienced by students was less than 5% and any problems were resolved without the need for technical support.

However, even without a clear differentiator from other LMSs, a significant group of students strongly preferred Canvas (Figure 2). Students provided statements that frequently referenced the “clean interface” and the “way Canvas looked” as indicators for preference. Given these rather weak justifications for their preference it suggests that by and large students do not have strong preferences for an LMS, and in the absence of a “game-changing” feature -or conversely, many problems- this opinion can be easily swayed by a good-looking interface. That said a few of the more substantive comments are provided at right.

**FIGURE 2: “Think about other LMSs you have used on campus – which LMS do you prefer?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Moodle</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Learn@UW</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Canvas</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think all LMS are</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basically the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Note on Figure 2: 4% of students could not make a decision on an LMS preference because they had limited LMS experience. That 4% was excluded from the above chart in order to make the above chart easier to read and interpret.

**Voice of the Student**

“I LOVED using Canvas. It was so simple and clear. The calendar component helped tremendously. It can be so hard to keep track of all the different assignments you have on Moodle or Learn@UW [D2L] -- it drives me insane. Canvas made it easy as pie. Couldn’t say enough good things about this program!”

“It has worked just fine for me. It doesn’t stand out in any huge way from Learn@UW [D2L], but I do like the flow of the site. I think it’s less boxy and not as cluttered. I also as noted before really like the course stream. I didn’t understand how it worked at first, but it is very helpful once you understand it.”

“Canvas is 100% essential in an online course, which is what I completed this semester. For on campus [face-to-face], access to a Canvas would be helpful but not essential.”
“For the first time I feel really in control. I wasn’t worrying about making mistakes that could limit access or change the course. It was easy…And I’m NOT a technical person.”

-Pilot faculty member response when asked what they liked about Canvas in end-of-semester interview.

**FACULTY**

At the end of the pilot, all faculty members were given one-on-one interviews with the evaluator. These interviews typically lasted for 30 to 45 minutes. At the time of this report, one interview is yet to be complete.

The feedback from faculty can seem contradictory. On one hand, nearly all faculty in the pilot thought Canvas was a great LMS. The ease-of-use came up as a theme again and again. Additionally, there was one faculty member who even said that, “It allowed [them] to teach the course they had always dreamed of teaching.”

However, even with this praise for Canvas, it was recommended not without reservations. In fact, only one of the participating faculty members recommended Canvas without qualification of their recommendation.

The reservations from the faculty stemmed from not being able to use quiz questions as hoped, lack of integration with systems (due mostly to limitations with the pilot and not Canvas itself), and not being able to get needed information out of Canvas (see sidebar on next page).

Many of the faculty members cited work by their instructional designers and that without instructional design support, there could be larger issues if Canvas were scaled on campus.

More generally, many of the pilot faculty had specific use cases where Canvas presented challenges, even though the more global assessment of Canvas was positive.

**NOTE:** For context, an examination of each of the participating faculty members experience with D2L prior to the pilot is provided as additional information at the end of this report.
The Special Case of the Fully Online Course

A Specific Instructors Perspective

As noted previously, Catherine Smith taught the only fully online course in the 2015 pilot. She viewed Canvas very favorably, but had an issue that (for her) made Canvas a “nonstarter.” She relies on analytic-type information (i.e., how many posts in online forums did students make, did individual students click into discussion threads, etc.) Dr. Smith uses this information to calculate a participation grade in her online classes, and she counts participation heavily. In this case she could not get what she needed from Canvas. For Dr. Smith she had to “guess” on participation, and she said she would not do that again. In her words, “If the issues associated with getting data out of Canvas cannot be resolved, I would not recommend the university switch to Canvas. I like the tool, but I can get what I need from my class now with D2L. This is a big concern that project leaders should understand, and I am not the only course that relies on these back-end metrics to calculate grades.”

The following user actions will generate participation analytics:
- loads a collaboration to view/edit a document
- joins a web conference
- posts a new comment to a discussion
- creates a page
- submits a quiz (student)
- starts taking a quiz (student)
- submits an assignment (student)
- updates a calendar event’s settings or description (both instructor courses and student calendar events)
- updates an assignment’s settings or description (instructor)

-Thank you to Kristy Bergeron, UW Madison Canvas Administrator for this information.

SUMMARY

( Faculty and Student Perceptions)

STUDENTS: As found in the previous WSOB pilot, we picked up on a significant vein of discontent among students at having to use multiple LMSs across campus. In the current pilot, students generally indicated that Canvas was not much different from other LMSs (with the exception of ease-of-use and some content engagement). Students want an LMS to do a few basic things well. For them, it is a vehicle. When asked to compare one vehicle to another with basically the same feature-set….the “prettiest” vehicle wins. In this case, students cited clean format and looks of Canvas as swaying their preferred choice. It is true that this layout and format could be a meaningful improvement. However, given other survey responses, it is this evaluator’s opinion that individuals who preferred Canvas may not hold that conviction strongly. Certainly the other information in the survey suggests that unifying on a single LMS is far more important.

FACULTY: Faculty also like the case-of-use, which is consistent with other evaluations of Canvas that have been conducted nationally (see for example Indiana University’s evaluation of Canvas: https://assets.uits.iu.edu/pdf/Faculty%20Evaluation%20Highlights.pdf). Instructional designers in this pilot also worked with faculty (as they would in any migration) in order to ensure a good student Canvas experience. Additionally, there are issues that were noted (and an issue that compels one faculty member to recommend AGAINST Canvas at left). These issues need to be considered before a large-scale adoption of Canvas.

The next section will address feedback from instructional technologists across campus. This should be a useful pairing to the faculty and student perspectives in this report. In light of the student and faculty responses there seems to be promising potential for Canvas, but specific functional concerns of Canvas need to be addressed for faculty. Students like Canvas as long as it is not ANOTHER LMS that added to the already crowded LMS campus ecosystem on the UW-Madison campus.
Feedback from the UW-Madison Canvas pilot instructional technologists are broken down into three sections: (1) Issue Discovery / Resolution, (2) Advice/ Questions for Canvas Leadership, and (3) Overall Issues / Summary.

**ISSUE DISCOVERY / RESOLUTION**

As part of their activities, the instructional technologists kept a running list of issues that were discovered or advanced by pilot instructors.

- Over 70 unique issues were recorded.
- 71% of these issues were “functional issues.” This means that 71% of issues were relating directly to features or functionality of Canvas (This is not surprising given the fact that 17 of the issues were from pilot faculty members who experienced issues as they were setting up or teaching their course).
- 24% of the issues logged were “administrative issues.” This means that 24% of the issues were related to the technical administration of Canvas.

In addition to the running list of issues, the instructional technologist group engaged in an exercise to compare the “top 10” features used in D2L and Moodle to Canvas. Using D2L and Moodle tool usage data provided by the Learn@UW [D2L] and Moodle services, various instructional technologists were assigned features by which to do their comparison (See the following Google document for a feature comparison of D@L and Canvas and Moodle: [http://tinyurl.com/odsutcp](http://tinyurl.com/odsutcp))
Instructional Technologists

Spring 2015 Canvas Pilot

Janice Kepka  College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Tom Tabone  College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Diana Wheeler  College of Engineering
Elizabeth Harris  College of Engineering
John Hoopes  College of Engineering
Mike Litzkow  College of Engineering
Paul Miller  College of Engineering
Rachel Bain  College of Letters and Science
Steel Wagstaff  College of Letters and Science
Emily Baker  Division of Continuing Studies
Todd Schwanke  Division of Student Life
Jenna Klinner  Facilities, Planning, and Management (FPM)
Heather McFadden  Graduate School
Jarrod Bogucki  Law School
Marc Korobkin  Law School
Miguel Ruiz  Libraries
Sheila Stoeckel  Libraries
Catherine Stephens  School of Education
Linda Endlich  School of Education
Jennifer Bonifas  School of Medicine and Public Health
Julie Martinelli  School of Medicine and Public Health
Kathy Hendricks  School of Medicine and Public Health
Kristin Simon  School of Medicine and Public Health
Yuyen Chang  School of Medicine and Public Health
George Jura  School of Nursing
Tim Piatt  School of Nursing
Amy Childs  School of Pharmacy
Mike Pitterle  School of Pharmacy
Tyler Gregory  School of Veterinary Medicine
Tara Cordes  University Health Services, Environmental Occupational Health

“Check and be sure that instruc[tonal] tech[ologists] in schools are tapped for support as key partners.”

It is difficult to pull any broad learning from the issues collected in the running issues list or the LMS feature comparison exercise beyond the fact that in general, each LMS has the same core functionality. (This is also consistent with the student finding that they generally didn’t see many differences between LMSs.) We found that for faculty and instructional technologists, the devil is in the details. They are interested in the settings and level of configurability available in core functionality. The functional issues range from student usage data reporting issues (of the variety noted by Catherine Smith in the previous section of this report) to grade book issues to (perhaps the largest functional concern) the amount of rework needed after the importing of quizzes from D2L or Moodle into Canvas. Suffice to say that the functional issues were varied.

ADVICE/QUESTIONS FOR CANVAS LEADERSHIP

Instructional technologists were asked midway though the pilot to provide feedback for the Canvas Leadership Team. Specifically, the question was framed in a way that emphasized everyone wanted success, and what should leadership be thinking about in order to make the
implementation of a new LMS (i.e., Canvas) successful.

21 responses were provided. The full texts of responses are provided in Appendix 2 of this report. However, using a broad categorization, the responses can be summarized into the following themes:

- 29% cited concerns with an LMS migration on campus. This category is mainly concerned with campus system interoperability, timeline or process (not Canvas as a tool per se).
- 24% noted potential concerns with Canvas to be aware of/examine. This category addressed concerns with the functionality (or lack of specific functionality) of Canvas directly.
- 19% cited concerns around communication and transparency with Canvas and any implementation.
- 19% provided questions to consider/activities to continue in the course of the pilot.

This is a broad categorization, but is also worth mentioning that there is real value in reviewing all of these comments in their entirety (in Appendix 2). The tone of the comments as a whole are genuinely focused around how to make this a successful campus implementation, and the comments highlight the different perspective that this group provides for campus around a potential Canvas implementation.

**OVERALL ISSUES / SUMMARY**

Over the course of this pilot there has been some unexpected, serendipitous learning. In the spirit of highlighting potential issues, this final section will address a few of these bigger concerns. In particular, I will focus on three broad issues for Canvas Leadership to consider: campus climate, Moodle users, and workflow/pedagogy changes requiring funding.

**Climate.** Converging the instructional technologist across campus to collaboratively explore Canvas did a couple of things: (1) started the conversation about moving campus to one LMS, (2) got people thinking about how we can work together to make this a reality, and (3) it allowed the D2L and Moodle communities to converge and have conversations about how the different areas of campus use (and govern) their respective LMSs.

In a campus that has largely adopted a normative practice of autonomy in the LMS space, the importance of this collaboration to change the campus climate and provide a forum for discussion around a singular LMS cannot be overstated. We are unique among our peers in that we are migrating from multiple systems that have relatively high user satisfaction. Other institutions (such as Indiana and Michigan who are fellow members of the Unizin consortium) are migrating from a single platform that is widely viewed as an inferior product to Canvas.

In addressing campus climate, certainly there is a role for increased messaging to campus (as noted in several of the open responses from instructional technologists). However, I would also recommend maintaining the structure that this diverse group of instructional technologists provides. This group could and should be a valuable advising body to Canvas and Unizin leadership. If there is a need to pause in the scaling of Canvas, it will be important that the cross-campus cooperative perspective be maintained in order to sustain the momentum that has been built in this initial phase.

Finally, it is important to note that the scope of this evaluation was to assess perceptions of Canvas. This report did not take into consideration issues around budget or future states that might need to be met. A future examination of this larger technical ecosystem is warranted in the future, to inform decisions regarding the LMS at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.
**Workflow/Pedagogy Changes and Funding.**

The feedback from faculty as well as the work by the instructional technologists found some gaps in functionality. This is either because the system doesn’t have the same functionality of our current LMSs, OR, Canvas doesn’t have native functionality that is equivalent to internal systems we’ve built to augment Moodle and/or D2L. This means that a move to Canvas will necessitate one of the following conditions:

1. A change in workflow or using work-arounds to maintain equivalency to current functionality.

2. A change in pedagogy because there is a recognition that there will NOT be equivalent functionality in Canvas.

Either option increases the workload of faculty and/or instructional technologists supporting the faculty, thereby increasing the resource hours needed to support a change in systems. There needs to be a consideration of resources that can be allocated to either develop technical “work-arounds” or to the utilization of human capital who can assist faculty in revising their courses with the options that are available within Canvas.
NOTE: The browser question was asked because in the WSOB pilot, individuals using Firefox had some difficulty with Canvas features. However, this difficulty seemed to vanish in the current pilot.
1) Please make a decision on what LMS will be supported on campus. Will it be Canvas only? Combo of Canvas & Moodle?
2) When will (?) D2L go away, if it is going away? 3) I worry about resource allocation to support the migration to Canvas.

MIGRATION WORKFLOW and give local admins choice to: 1) If a tool exists to fix problem, give them access to the tool so that they can do it themselves. 2) Report it to Instructure or whomever as a ticket they would solve

Ramp up. My main recommendation is that the Canvas initiative should be ramped up to include the actual roll-out of a minimal # of courses. This will be the only way to allow immersion into the toolset of Canvas. Otherwise we're merely putting the "pressure test" of truly knowing this LMS' limitations & positive features. 1 or 2 courses per school.

Need to test with LARGE courses (300+), - Need to see real responsiveness from Canvas with respect to addressing issues (not just promises), - Plan for large-scale migration, - what happens with custom content not currently supported by Canvas?, - Choose pilot courses carefully to test all aspects of Canvas/migration

Migration!!! When already built courses have elements (especially structurally integral ones) that don't exist in Canvas (say Lesson Module in Moodle or Multipart Discussion Forums, or release conditions or a custom gradebook) that don't import successfully, who will fix/rebuild? And how? At whose expense?

How/who will handle migrations? CANNOT leave this to faculty* What about custom needs? *Targeted pedagogies/best practices should be identified. The tech should not define the teaching w/o understanding the tradeoffs* - Better communication about why, - How will we not end up in same powerless position w/ Canvas as w/ D2L, - How will Canvas allow (or disallow) the UW to strategically leverage its education as a "selling pt", - How will support model interact w/ Colleges and their goals?, - Who is going to fix/rebuild courses that include unsupported (in Canvas) structures that are integral to course (at whose cost?) *How do we leverage LMS transition as an opportunity to encourage faculty to improve & rethink their course?* How do we do this in a way that is sensitive to the needs to individual colleges
APPENDIX 2 CONT.: 22 Questions/Comments/Considerations for Canvas Leadership from Instructional Technologists

Transparency with campus - there is a lot of buzz about Canvas & what it means - lot of misinformation. I realize some major decisions / timelines haven’t been figured out yet but silence causes unnecessary anxiety with a lot of faculty. Would be helpful to have more buy-in. Canvas has a lot of positive aspects - sharing resources/learning objectives, etc. that can be played up to get people excited. Many people are concerned about D2L going away in less than 2 years - what does this mean? What type of support will there be for the migration? Any? Etc…

MESSAGE FOR LEADERSHIP: 1. The direction campus is moving re:LMS is unclear. It seems we are moving to Canvas but no one has come out and stated this is happening or is a goal. That makes a lot of the other work we are doing problematic as the context of the work is unclear. Are we running Canvas through its paces in consideration of adoption? Are we moving to Canvas? The work/comparisons to D2L/Moodle would take on a different character and flavor if that is the case. Campus and this group needs a clearer message about the status and goals of the "Canvas Pilot" from leadership. Timeline needed. 2. Assuming we are moving to Canvas a migration process/workflow and resources need to be planned for and allocated.

An actual campus-wide needs assessment needs to be done. If the needs assessment shows that we do not need Canvas, we should not adopt Canvas.

As a member of Unizin most affordances will be for Canvas users. It seems now is the time for campus officials to start articulate more clearly affordances OF Canvas. If we decide to do away with D2L, we need to start the Canvas PR campaign now; and at high levels. - For pilot phase two could we increase or woo faculty/instructors who are hesitant users or difficult cases, not usual suspects. - Now is the time for efficiencies. If the political goodwill is there let's move to one LMS. Students want it! - Scale planning now for migration (e.g. cost, expertise, etc.)

Pressure Canvas to commit to escalating Unizin proposed changes, so the tool will have the functionality we currently have in our LMSs
There is (and will continue to be) a need to provide a process & financial support for building in flexibility into the interface that is accessible for diverse and rapidly changing faculty, staff, and student needs. e.g. what (API's) exist to import discipline specific tools that changes over time

What should the Canvas pilot team do now? 1) Keep working with educational technologist to collect user feedback. 2) Set up a blog or site for open discussions on technical issues. 3) Migration needs to be considered carefully. 4) Needs to convince people Canvas is a better option/choice.

Need to agree as a Unizin group what the expectations are for accessibility for the Canvas tool. It will likely be problematic if different campuses have different expectations or standards. To achieve this agreement, some campuses may have to raise their standards, and others may need to lower their expectations/standards. Suggest having a central group within Unizin whose role it is to escalate high priority issues, prioritize other issues, and make decisions that all can live with.

*Gain clear understanding of the Unizin processes/procedures for escalating tool issues *Formalize the communication around a) Canvas adoption and b) D2L/Moodle potential sunsetting. People are currently investing time/money building courseware on D2L and Moodle and need to know if either of those platforms are going away. *Insert some pressure onto Instructure to gain visibility to their product roadmap. It would benefit Canvas users to know what features/enhancements Canvas will gain in the next 6-12 months. The vend has some responsibility to provide this, but it will probably take leadership asking for us to acquire roadmap info, as this is notoriously difficult to get from vendors. *Change management - Faculty are NOT going to like being told to use one LMS.

There are no technological advantages to adopting Canvas. That's not to say it's a bad product, but it offers nothing that Moodle doesn't already offer. I can’t speak to any cost savings because I don't have that information but if we switch to Canvas we will be forced to undergo a long and difficult migration that will not be able to completely replicate what we already have.
If the pilot is going well, it would be helpful to see actual examples of these courses - what do they look like? Still seem to be a lot of issues with Canvas and no clear solutions yet

Continue to explore and consider how UW-Madison can support more than one LMS

Check and be sure that instruc tech in schools are tapped for support as key partners

Teaching is not a solo activity. It is a collaborative activity. Integration of LMS with existing library course services such as reserves and research instruction is critical to faculty convenience, student convenience, and student success. Student success impacts retention. Librarian access to courses can create efficiencies and create opportunities for students to learn critical 21st c. information skills. PS - this is just one example of a collaboration that should be enables. Other types of acad. staff offer much.
Additional Reference Information: LMS Usage Info of Participating Faculty

Canvas Pilot Instructors & Previous D2L Tool Usage

E5 250 - Tracey Holloway

- E5 250, Spring 2014 - OU 2367789
- 47 students
- Content (54 items posted; primarily PPT presentations)
- Discussion (1 forum; 6 topics; 77 threads with 184 replies)
- Quizzes (10 total)
- Gradebook (43 custom gradebook items)
- News (2 items)
- No navbar or homepage customizations

PHM PRAC 490 - Beth Martin

** There isn’t a recent D2L course for this offering. In Spring 2014 D2L was used.**

- PHARM 631, Spring 2014 - OU 2362906
- 9 students
- Content (32 items posted; primarily PPT presentations)
- No news items
- No navbar or homepage customizations

ES 126 – Cathy Middlecamp

- ES 126, Spring 2014 - OU 2320379
- 98 students
- Dropbox (11 set up and submitted to)
- Quizzes (2 total)
- Gradebook (39 custom gradebook items)
- Used Content only to post one single topic, which was a link to a website for the course
- Used i>clicker integration with the course
- No news items
Additional Reference Information: LMS Usage Info of Participating Faculty

(CONTINUED)

Canvas Pilot Instructors & Previous D2L Tool Usage

LIS 655 – Catherine Smith

* LIS 655, Spring 2014 - OU 2365001
* 26 students
* Content (143 items posted; variety of types including PPT, Word, websites, etc.)
* News (2 items)
* Discussion (33 forums; 93 topics; 516 threads with 1852 replies)
* Dropbox (8 set up and submitted to)
* Quizzes (11 total)
* Gradebook (6 custom gradebook items)
* Slight navbar customizations; no homepage customizations