



DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD OF PASCO COUNTY

Kurt S. Browning, Superintendent of Schools

7227 Land O' Lakes Boulevard • Land O' Lakes, Florida 34638

Purchasing Services

Michael J. Woodall, CPPO, Purchasing Agent

813/ 794-2221 Fax: 813/ 794-2112

727/ 774-2221 TDD: 813/794-2484

352/ 524-2221 e-mail: mwoodall@pasco.k12.fl.us

May 7, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable School Board Members

FROM: Michael J. Woodall, CPPO, Purchasing Agent *MJW*

SUBJECT: Request for Permission to Negotiate with Canvas by Instructure

In accordance with Florida Statutes 1002.37 and 1002.415, and Senate Bill 1676, beginning with the 2009-2010 school year each school district must provide eligible K-12 students with the option of participating in a virtual instruction program.

To provide students enrolled in Pasco County with a variety of learning opportunities, and to support integration of technology and information literacy skills required for the implementation of the Common Core State Standards, Pasco eSchool is requesting approval to negotiate a contact with Canvas Instructure, a Learning Management System (LMS) provider.

After establishing review criteria a District Committee identified a list of potential LMS providers to present their solutions. After these presentations, Canvas by Instructure was selected as the best fit to meet the needs of the District. Per Florida Administrative Code Rule 6A-1.012(11)(a) the District is exempt from bidding these services. Please see the attached memo from JoAnne Glenn, Principal for Pasco eSchool for additional information.

At this time, we are requesting permission to negotiate a contract with Canvas by Instructure. After negotiations are complete the contract will be presented at a future Board meeting for approval. Any costs associated with the resulting contract will be funded through Virtual Education Contribution budget allocation.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact Ms. JoAnne Glenn, Principal for Pasco eSchool or me at your earliest convenience.

Attachments

Date/Time: May 1, 2013 11:51:00



DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD OF PASCO COUNTY

Kurt S. Browning, Superintendent of Schools

7227 Land O' Lakes Boulevard • Land O' Lakes, Florida 34638

Pasco eSchool
JoAnne Glenn, Principal
813/ 346-1901 FAX: 813/ 346-1991
E-MAIL: jglenn@pasco.k12.fl.us

April 30, 2013

To: Michael Woodall, Purchasing Agent

From: JoAnne Glenn, Principal for Pasco eSchool

Subject: Request for Permission to Negotiate (Canvas by Instructure)

In accordance with Florida Statute 1002.415, 1002.37 and Senate Bill 1676, beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, each school district shall provide eligible K-12 students within its boundaries the option of participating in a virtual instruction program on a full time or part time basis. The virtual instruction program makes instruction available to students using online and distance learning technology in the nontraditional classroom.

To provide the students enrolled in Pasco County with a variety of learning opportunities, and to support the integration of technology and information literacy skills required for the implementation of the Common Core State Standards, Pasco eSchool requests approval to begin negotiation of a contract with the following Learning Management System (LMS) provider:

- Canvas by Instructure

A decision to partner with Canvas by Instructure offers the District an opportunity to support a blended instructional model for professional development and for classroom instruction for all staff, students, and parents. Such a model will allow for closer monitoring of student progress, increased integration of online professional development modules and virtual coursework with existing district systems, and build the capacity of our students and staff to collaborate by removing barriers of time and physical location. Additionally, this Learning Management System will include features to increase the capacity of parents to view information about student performance.

In February, 2013, a district committee comprised of teachers, technology specialists, school administrators, and district staff met to identify needs that our current Learning Management System, Moodle, did not serve. After a problem-solving discussion, a consensus was reached for members of the committee to review options for Learning Management Systems.

From these reviews, a list of potential LMS providers was identified, and three companies accepted an invitation to present their LMS solutions for the district in March. A rubric was used to evaluate the functionality of these systems, and a copy of that document is included as an attachment to this request.

It is the recommendation of this committee to negotiate a contract for Learning Management Systems services at this time to allow for the delivery of professional development to our teachers and

administrators this summer. Additionally, the timing of the Learning Management System acquisition will allow for the requirements contained in the RFP for our Local Instructional Improvement System (LIIS) and Student Information System (SIS) to include a plan for interfacing with this important teaching and learning tool. The integration of a Learning Management System with the LIIS/SIS supports district goals under the Race to the Top grant.

The costs associated with any resulting contract will be funded through Virtual Education Contribution budget allocation, earned by students enrolled in the district's virtual instruction program.

Criteria for the evaluation of learning management systems

This set of criteria may be used as a starting point for your LMS deliberations.

The LMS selection process is often more about selecting a path than a product. Paths are selected based on institutional values and leadership; products are selected based on features and personal preferences. For example, some institutions put a high value on control, stability and the ability to customize their applications and shape the future of the product they select as an LMS. Others are more comfortable with a product that is defined and supported by a commercial firm that innovates on behalf of their clients.

Detailed feature comparisons rarely produce the insight needed by the LMS selection process. Feature convergence blurs the distinction among LMS offerings because truly innovative features spread from one LMS to another. The integration of new services into the LMS based on open standards has become commonplace. The look-and-feel of most LMS can be periodically refreshed through theming. Outcomes and broad functionalities assessed through actual experience in using the LMS are better predictors than a feature-by-feature comparison.

The criteria in this template focus on outcomes and functions rather than features. For example, a set of features for discussion forums (accessible to the class, threaded by topic, with links to resources and other thread) might be replaced with a functional criterion requiring students to learn from each other through open discussion and debate. Alternatively, the LMS selection process may design a tractable set of user stories¹ for which solutions (scripts or recipes) are offered for comparison among LMS options.

This grid was adapted from several sources on e-learning systems evaluations including [McGill University's work on LMS selection](#). The intent is that you modify the content below to reflect your institution's specific needs and values. You are welcome to adapt this grid according to the Creative Commons license referenced below. ²

¹ A user story for an LMS is a short statement in the everyday language of the instructor or learner that captures in a series of steps what a user needs to do. User stories define the functions an LMS should provide by capturing the 'who', 'what' and 'why' of a requirement in a simple, concise way, often limited in detail.

² This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.5/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

Instructions: First, define the “deal breakers” – those features which, if missing or inadequate, render a product useless to you. Then apply the “use case” approach for each product you are considering: “What will be the quality of my experience?”

Score each as “Acceptable” “Unacceptable” or “Recommended”

Evaluation Rubric	Fair	Good	Excellent	Score
Pedagogical design	Provides basic access to organized materials but few opportunities for interaction, constructivist or engaging methods.	Provides basic access to content as well as tools for engaging students, interactive learning.	Provides access to content that integrates well with interactive tools, and new pedagogical tools are being routinely added to the system.	
Design and layout	Functional interface with decent layout but somewhat complex and counterintuitive. Aesthetics are bland or distracting.	Good functional interface that can be navigated with minimal training. Good look and feel.	Simple, intuitive interface with minimal clicks to access materials, little or no training needed to get started, and the look and feel is inviting.	
Migration of existing courses	Some migration tools exist but the tools and documentation are either inadequate or difficult to use.	Good tools are provided and well documented, but the migrated material will need additional formatting.	Excellent migration tools with great documentation. All migrated course materials are ready to use.	
Content authoring	Provides a basic means for uploading and storing content in a hierarchical manner to support teaching and learning.	Allows basic content to be uploaded or created within an authoring system that is part of the LMS.	Provides a suite of tools for authoring media-rich content, importing content, drag-and-drop interfaces, as well as uploading rich content types such as podcasts, video clips, etc. Allows metadata creation for easier/better management.	
Content organization	LMS provides a basic repository for course content.	LMS provides a repository for content and basic tools for content organization.	LMS provides a framework for diverse storage and use strategies, from public, private and shared workspaces, to subscription-based content (e.g., podcasts and feeds) to archival content.	

Evaluation Rubric	Fair	Good	Excellent	Score
Copyright management	No specific tools for either authoring or consuming intellectual property.	A fixed set of copyright options is available to the content author.	Authors are given choices (such as Creative Commons) for their content, and consumers (students) are reminded of their responsibilities.	
Course export	Permits course content to be exported and reimported into the LMS itself but may have limited ability to export to another LMS.	Allows course structure and content to be exported but in formats that constrain how the exported content may be imported elsewhere.	Exports course structure and content, as well as selected sub-elements of a course, using an industry-standard such as IMS Content Packaging so that courses can be imported into another LMS.	
Archives	Some archival tools but much of the process is manual. Archived courses are not available to be viewed by the instructor.	Good archival tools that support backup of completed courses with student submissions and discussions intact. The LMS administrator must set up instructor access to the completed course.	Powerful archive tools that support automatic backup of completed courses with student submissions and discussions intact. Instructors have full access and control of completed courses.	
Communication	LMS provides secure access to the email addresses that comprise the class roster, but individuals may not be selectable for private email.	Both asynchronous (email) and synchronous communication tools are present.	LMS provides a high level of flexibility for the use of email (asynchronous by roster, individual or group) as well as instant messaging, chat and threaded discussions.	
File exchange	LMS provides secure drop-box functionality so that students can exchange materials with instructors.	LMS provides drop-box and ability for students and faculty to upload resources to a central course repository.	LMS provides secure drop-boxes and shared folders for file exchange among students as well as instructors and allows for bulk downloads of attached files.	

Evaluation Rubric	Fair	Good	Excellent	Score
Sections and groups	LMS allows instructors to define sub-groups of students within the class roster for purposes of communication and collaborative work.	LMS allows sub-groups but allows the instructor the choice of interacting with only the sub-group or the entire course in all available tools.	LMS provides the hierarchy to support sections within a single course so that course content is shared among sections. Instructors can define sub-groups of students which then link to separate content repositories and tools.	
E-portfolio	Basic tools allow students and instructors to gather student work products for assessment and presentation.	Tools allow students and instructors to create ad-hoc or structured presentations of resources.	A full-featured e-portfolio tool is integrated into the LMS and makes possible the gathering, review and presentation of work products to support any portfolio strategy (resume, learning, tenure, etc). Reporting tools allow for individual, departmental or institutional assessments.	
Discussion tools	Adequate speed and functionality with the ability to attach files	Quick and functional with user profiles or pictures, file attachments and html interface.	Extremely fast and highly functional with user profiles and pictures, files attachments and easy html interface.	
Testing and assessment tools	A simple test generator with the ability to add multiple choice, true/false, short answer and essay questions.	More than a simple test generator, this system provides tools for creating assessments with images or other attached files.	More than a simple test generator, this system provides tools for creating assessments with multimedia, learning games, and other interactive tools such as polls. Tests can provide immediate feedback with tips for remediation.	
Course evaluations	Basic survey tools for capturing student reflections on course, instructor	Anonymous evaluations that can be gathered by the faculty including question pools and templates.	Hierarchical and flexible system for anonymous evaluations at course, department and institutional level for either summative or formative purposes. Includes item pools, templating, announcements, reminders, and tools to easily target different audiences.	

Evaluation Rubric	Fair	Good	Excellent	Score
Gradebook and student tracking	Moderately functional grade book that is relatively easy to use. Minimal tools for student tracking.	Functional grade book that is easy to use. Grades can be exported to a spreadsheet. Student tracking tools give the instructor some information about student progress.	Highly functional grade book that is easy to use. Grades can be exported to a spreadsheet of student information system. Student tracking tools give the instructor information about what pages the student has viewed and what tasks have been completed. The student can be automatically emailed when their participation is substandard.	
Calendar and selective release	Basic calendar. Selective release is possible but may be cumbersome to set up.	Basic calendar with pop-up announcements. Release of course content and assessments can be scheduled for student access with moderate effort.	Collaborative calendar with pop-up announcements. Release of course content and assessments can be easily scheduled for student access.	
Collaboration	Allows shared access to files among users and some tools for asynchronous collaboration.	Provides access to shared files and some tools for asynchronous and synchronous collaboration and communication. Limited group functionality.	Provides a campus-wide framework that supports collaborative work such as wiki with version tracking, threaded discussion, instant messaging and chat, whiteboard, web conferencing (audio and video). Enables subgroups to be defined within courses for collaboration. Provides non-course sites to support special project work among small groups.	
Learning analytics	Grades and basic statistics are gathered for each learner, and basic usage reports generated.	Grades, basic and fine-grained statistics are gathered for each learner, by course, by department and across the institution. Forensic reports are available for resolving controversies.	Provides in-depth data gathering and reporting on learning outcomes based on configurable rubrics, and allows for longitudinal analysis of cohorts as well as individuals, including eportfolios.	

Evaluation Rubric	Fair	Good	Excellent	Score
Integration with Student Information System	Integration is possible but will require a high level of product customization.	Tools for integration are available but some tasks will need to be completed manually or in a batch process.	Seamless integration with automatic updating of student and faculty lists and all rosters. Students can be automatically emailed course access information. Student and faculty profiles with pictures and syllabi can be shared between the LMS and the SIS.	
Integration with Campus Authentication	Ability to batch load users from a campus central identity system.	Ability to batch load users but also to integrate a campus single sign-on system such as CAS.	A real-time connection with a campus central identity system (LDAP, AD, Shibboleth) that avoids the need for batch processes. Integration with campus single sign-on.	
Integration with library resources	Limited to no integration with locally licensed library content.	Ability to create resources that can be resolved to library-controlled databases.	Tools are present that allow faculty to find and reference both public and licensed library materials, including full texts. Students are able to access these materials once logged into the system from any location.	
Integration with campus portal	LMS is accessible through the campus portal but only by linking that requires a separate authentication by the user.	LMS is linked with the portal via single sign-on, but the only level of integration possible is the iFrame.	LMS and portal share single sign-on and select tools can be integrated with the portal via industry-standard integrations (JSR-168 or WSRP).	
Vision and product roadmap	The vendor or developer community does not make public their technical or pedagogical vision for the LMS, and the timing of future releases may be unclear.	Vision and roadmap are loosely available via conferences or insider knowledge but not published for public view or critique.	LMS vendor or developer community has published their vision for both the technical and pedagogical aspects of the product, and timing of releases is clear and adhered to.	
Support	Email support only.	Email support and limited phone support.	24/7 phone and email support with tracking system to follow the progress of issue resolution.	

Evaluation Rubric	Fair	Good	Excellent	Score
Textbook publisher support	Some textbook materials but difficult to find, request or install.	Several supported texts with good materials that can be installed with moderate efforts.	Many supported texts, excellent well-organized materials, easily installed and based on industry or community standards (<i>e.g.</i> , Common Cartridge)	
Training materials	Fair printed materials, minimal online training or classroom training sessions available.	Good printed materials, some online training or classroom training sessions available.	Excellent printed materials and many opportunities for online and classroom training sessions.	
Online help resources	A users' manual is accessible online.	Help files are accessible at each step of a process, and system documentation is accessible online.	Contextually-appropriate help files are accessible from all pages and provide assistance for students, faculty and system administrators as appropriate. Pop-ups or rollovers provide "just-in-time" information for specific actions.	
Use of open standards	Standards are seen as a goal, but the implementation of standards is missing or incomplete.	Open standards (IMS CP, QTI, etc) are used in the LMS but are incomplete or are built in combination with proprietary methods that create "product lock-in" and inflexibility.	Open standards are incorporated wherever appropriate in the LMS and are leveraged to provide as many options as possible. No proprietary components are present that require separate licensing or lock in data.	
Speed of system	Course material access times are adequate on high speed connections but frustrating for dial-up users.	Access times are very good for students on high speed connections and adequate for dial-up users.	The fastest system available with support for streaming media and/or offline companion materials to better serve dial-up users.	
Server requirements	LMS only operates on one operating system and requires special configurations of hardware or supporting software.	LMS is available on multiple platforms but does not offer compatibility with an implementer's choice of application server or database.	Server software operates on a wide variety of operating systems (Windows, Linux/Unix, Mac) using commodity hardware and industry-standard web servers.	

Evaluation Rubric	Fair	Good	Excellent	Score
Scalability	LMS has no problem meeting demands of a small institution on a single server.	LMS supports clustering and the ability for multiple servers to act in unison, but there are few installations supporting over a thousand concurrent users.	LMS clusters well and has been known to support installations well over ten thousand concurrent users.	
Browser setup and support	Supports the most popular browsers with end user set up and installation of necessary components. May have a "preferred" browser for proper operation.	Supports most browsers with minimal effort from the user.	Supports all browsers and platforms with no special setup requirements for the user. Is able to render the LMS experience in most browsers with consistency.	

This evaluation table provided by



This grid was adapted from several sources on e-learning systems evaluations including [McGill University's work on LMS selection](#)

This table is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.5/>