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CCLE Timeline

- **Spring 2005**  FCET recommends that UCLA converge on a single solution, “a consistent, powerful, and transparent application.”

- **June 2006**  The FSG/TSG jointly recommend that UCLA converge on a single open source solution.

- **October 2006**  Based on the Assessment Task Force Report, the FCET unanimously selects Moodle as the open source platform.

- **April 2007**  CCLE Alpha Project Oversight Group (POG) implements Alpha Moodle service.

- **May 2007**  CCLE Planning Team appointed “to engage in broad campus consultation and to recommend the appropriate scope, scale, staffing, architecture, operation, use and funding for the next phase of the CCLE initiative.”

- **August 2007**  CCLE Planning Team submits report and budget documents

- **Fall 2007**  CITI reviews the CCLE Plan and recommends funding
CCLE Plan: Converge on Moodle

26 different course management systems

Unit System

Campus-wide Shared System

Possible Regional System

CCLE Moodle environment
CCLE Plan: Design Principles

- Recognize school / division staff and support as the CCLE foundation.
- Encourage broad adoption.
- Make planning and governance open and participatory.
- Ensure that academic priorities and faculty / student experience drive decisions.
- Support innovation, creativity, and flexibility.
- Allow for more than one Moodle installation if needed.
- Choose a CCLE administrative home with strong academic values (OID).
CCLE Plan:
Stakeholder Endorsements

- Campus Computing Council (CCC)
  “the plan provides the necessary framework for the Schools and Divisions to opt-in”

- CCLE Functional Oversight Committee (FOC)
  “we endorse the planning document”

- Faculty Committee on Educational Technology (FCET)
  “unanimously in support of the planning document”

- Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
  “strong endorsement for a common experience”

- Deans / CIOs Who Chose to Meet With the Planning Team
  “Fine model,” “positively disposed,” “supportive of concept and direction,”
  “reasonable plan,” “we’re on board” “so far so good” “a solution that appeals”
## CCLE Funding Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 5-year cost</td>
<td>$24,103,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% contributed by schools divisions, central units, and IEI.</td>
<td>$20,584,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% requested from the Chancellor to support collaboration and to leverage that investment</td>
<td>$3,518,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School / Division Funds to Support Faculty and Students

- Budget reflects an average of the funds already invested by schools and divisions

- For each school/division, the actual amount invested reflects the needs and demands of the faculty

- Minimum resources needed
  - Staff to support and train faculty and students. Average .75 FTE / 100 courses
  - Technical support for faculty. Average .5 permanent FTE / 100 courses and .2 FTE students

- Many schools and divisions already invest more resources
  - More extensive faculty support
  - Custom programming and application development
Chancellor’s Funds to Support Collaboration

- CCLE staff.
  - Coordinator.
  - Lead developer / integration programmer.
  - Testing and support lead.
  - Intellectual property adviser.
  - .25 Leader of Standards & Practices Group (buyout).
- School and division staff time for planning and coordination (5 hours/unit).
- Extra hardware for shared systems.
- Grants for innovation and enhancements.
CCLE Strategic Impact

- Maximum impact from significant campus investment in educational technology.
- Common user experience for students and faculty.
- Shared solutions, systems, and tools.
- Research collaboration and learning sites.
- A model for future shared academic systems
- Platform for creativity and innovation.
Schools / Divisions Can ...

- Get full value from ongoing investment in educational technology.
- Benefit from ongoing enhancements and innovation at least cost.
- Devote more local staff time to direct faculty support and less to basic system testing and maintenance.
- Get a richer set of services from Central academic service units (OID, Library, ATS, Registrar, etc).
- Receive support for staff time contributed to collaboration and coordination tasks.
Opting in

- Deans decide when and if to opt in
- Participation can start small and evolve
- Key commitments needed:
  - Active interest and willingness to participate
  - Staff for the planning process
  - Local staff to support your faculty who use it
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Questions?