

# APARC Minutes – 12/12/17

---

Minute: Laura Krier

Attendees: Laura Lupei, Laura Krier, Karen Moranski, Kathy Morris, Mark Perri, Daniel Soto, Mike Visser, Beth Warner, Laura Watt, Merith Weisman

Guests: Sandy Ayala (ATISS) and Justin Lipp (Faculty Center)

## 1. Update on LMS pilot from ATISS

- a. ATISS was asked to assess learning management systems this fall in response to low faculty use, faculty complaints about Moodle, and a significant Moodle outage in November, 2016.
- b. They saw demos of different options, surveyed faculty about satisfaction with Moodle, and narrowed down to two possible options: migrating to Canvas, or switching to a hosted solution for Moodle.
- c. A select group of faculty will be involved in a Canvas pilot in Spring, 2018. Faculty are primarily senior faculty, for whom the potential of negative SETIs related to the LMS will be less impactful. They will be getting feedback from both faculty and students using Canvas in the pilot.
  - i. Mike Visser suggested adding some pilot participants who don't currently use Moodle.
- d. Sandy Ayala presenting some of the features of Canvas and differences from Moodle. There was general discussion about the features and options.
- e. Kathy Morris raised concerns about the timeline for a potential migration, pointing out the importance of giving faculty sufficient time to transition.
- f. APARC would like to see a cost analysis. This is complicated by the fact that there is no current software cost for running Moodle, only staff and infrastructure, which are harder to measure. It was suggested that Elias Lopez should come to an APARC meeting to discuss potential resource implications of migration.
- g. Mike Visser asked about the longevity and reliability of the company developing and support Canvas, Instructure. Instructure has been around since 2008; Canvas was developed in 2011.
- h. There were questions about how pre-determined the decision might already be. Sandy indicated that the spring pilot is a true pilot, and no decision is a foregone conclusion. **Sandy will send a timeline of the project, including dates for getting a report from the pilot participants and a recommendation from ATISS.**

## 2. APARC Charge

- a. The committee's charge has been modified slightly to reflect alignment with the budget cycle.
- b. Because the budget cycle will be changing in the future, the decision was made to keep the language in the charge non-specific regarding dates or semesters, to give the committee flexibility.

- c. Mike will send the updated charge to Structure and Functions.
- 3. Senate Diversity Subcommittee Liaison to APARC
  - a. The SDS current sends a liaison to EPC, related to their interest in program review. The question was raised whether they should instead have a liaison to APARC or UPRS.
  - b. Structure and Functions changed the charge of SDS to a less specific “advise in program review.”
  - c. The liaison only occasionally attends EPC, so Laura Watt suggested that we might not need an official liaison.
  - d. Recommendation was agreed to eliminate the liaison role until a clear need is seen.
- 4. Strategic Priority Recommendations from AY 2016-17
  - a. The committee reviewed our strategic priority recommendations from AY 2016-17 to reflect on what is underway, what might need to be re-emphasized, and what might need to be added for AY 2017-18 recommendations.
  - b. Strategic planning process on campus is underway, and its outcomes will have an impact on the tactical and strategic recommendations APARC makes. It’s hard to make recommendations now, when strategic planning is still in process. This is, in some sense, a “bridge” year.
  - c. Budget framework review is also being undertaken, but is incomplete.
- 5. Strategic Priorities survey
  - a. Last year we talked about regularly surveying faculty to get input on needs, interests, and recommendations for strategic priorities. Mike started working on a survey, but it’s challenging while strategic planning is underway.
  - b. We discussed various other methods for getting feedback from faculty, and from whom it would be appropriate for us to gather feedback.
  - c. We discussed what the Strategic Planning Task Force is planning, in terms of surveying faculty and getting input. We don’t want to compete with their surveys, but instead to work collaboratively with them.
  - d. APARC would be very interested in getting data (raw data) from the surveying done by the Strategic Planning Task Force.
  - e. This year, we will hold off on formally surveying faculty and academic staff, with the assumption that data will be shared with us from the Strategic Planning Task Force.