

**Learning Management System Advisory Group (LMSAG)  
Faculty Review Task Force**

Sponsors: Assistant Vice Presidents Patricia Book and Jeanette VanGalder

**Membership:**

Chair: David Kendrick, CETL  
Co -Chair: Nancy Matchett, HSS, Philosophy

**Faculty:**

Kathy Cochrane, HSS, Psychology  
Jamie Erskine, NHS, Dietetics  
Gregory Heald, Library  
John Luckner, EBS, Special Education  
Richard Newmark, MCB, Accounting  
Sasha Sidorkin, EBS, Teacher Education  
Anne Toewe, PVA, Theatre Arts and Dance  
Ben Varner, HSS, English  
Nancy White, NHS, Nursing

**Ex-Officios:**

Kate Boyer, CETL  
Sherri Lancton, ES  
Ryan Rose, IT

The purpose of the Faculty Review Task Force is to provide advice from a representative group of faculty to the LMSAG so they have the benefit of the faculty perspective as they consider continuous improvement to our current learning management system environment at UNC.

Specifically, the charge to the Faculty Subcommittee is to:

- (1) Create an overall framework and plan that should guide all future Learning Management System (LMS) decisions including LMS system decisions and processes for considering system upgrades from the perspective of instructional value. You might consider who should be involved in the review process, how should reviewers be determined, what resources are needed to support the faculty review, what kind of venues should be available to gather faculty views effectively, what kinds of testing environments should be constructed to thoroughly test courses after upgrades occur to minimize last minute surprises after an upgrade, and what kind of training should be available and in what formats. This framework should consider the evaluation of the pros and cons of proposals for LMS system choices, upgrades, new feature releases and the timing of system changes so as to be least disruptive to instruction. The framework should

provide for faculty input to help us understand the issues with the product and assess whether or not they are resolved. The time horizon for this plan should be three years to provide an annual basis for faculty input and to establish a systematic pattern for these decision processes.

- (2) Apply this framework to an evaluation of BlackBoard Upgrade 8.0 and 9.0. Recommendations should include the pros and cons of each upgrade, recommendations on timing, suggestions on the testing environment, and the schedule and delivery method(s) for faculty training consistent with instructional calendars and anticipated training timeframes desired.

The Subcommittee should report back to the Sponsors periodically. We would suggest a 10 week timeframe to complete this initial charge.

Anticipated deliverables:

1. List of benchmark institutions and types of best practices in LMS use discovered.
2. Report on feedback from faculty regarding experience with BlackBoard 7.0 summarizing key instructional issues.
3. UNC Policies/Procedures document that articulates purpose, use, and benefits of current LMS system (BlackBoard), referencing benchmark examples discovered.
4. Spreadsheet/rubrics for what will be tested in a test environment (test syllabus, test exam, e.g. to try each feature rather than assume it will be there).
5. Recommendation of processes/methods /instruments to systematically and effectively gather feedback from faculty colleagues more broadly regarding LMS system and building blocks that integrate with the application using both internal resources and vendor resources; annual plan specifying who, what, when as a guide.
6. Apply framework to BlackBoard Upgrades (8.0 and 9.0), e.g. educate stakeholders on the releases and their features using internal and vendor resources; ascertain their feedback; provide report, including pros and cons, to LMSAG.

July 6, 2009