

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM: 6.D

DATE: February 25, 2010

Subject: Implementing D2L's Grade Export Function

When the system contracted with D2L, there was the expectation that there would be full integration between Colleague and this course management system. Specifically, it was thought that complete course registration information would be exported from Colleague to D2L and grades would be exported from D2L to Colleague. Processes and procedures to export registration information from Colleague to D2L were implemented. However, the ability to export grades from D2L to Colleague was not in place when the system came on line. While there were plans to complete this, little progress has been.

To exacerbate this situation, there was a problem with the pilot project as grades were exported this fall semester. As a result, D2L has asked about South Dakota's interest in this project. While the D2L Management Committee has been working on this project, discussions held by BOR led to the conclusion that this really is a Council decision and it was agreed that AAC was the most logical place to start.

Carla Reihe prepared a brief history of the project and included some supporting documentation. These are attached. In addition, Ms. Reihe suggested that the following possible options for our consideration including:

1. Use the existing process as it currently functions, knowing not all faculty are required to use it and not all validation can/will be done on the D2L side;
2. Modify the process to come closer to the Colleague grade validation process knowing that D2L is not a Student Information and does not contain all the information needed to verify grades like Colleague can;
3. Discontinue all use of grading integration in D2L; or
4. Other.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Discussion.

As I have reviewed these materials, I suggest that there more likely are only two options to consider:

1. Use the existing process as it currently functions, knowing that D2L is not a Student Information and does not contain all the information needed to verify grades that is available in Colleague; or
2. Discontinue all use of grading integration in D2L.

While implementing this functionality places the responsibility to assign “correct” grades upon the faculty, this is a well-established requirement.

Members of the Council should be prepared to discuss this and to provide direction to the D2L Management Committee.

From: Reihe, Carla
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 11:21 AM
To: Gingerich, Sam
Cc: Hansen, Dave - RIS; Gabriel, Jodi; Anderson, Cathy
Subject: FW: SDBOR Phase 2 Grades Project

Dr. Gingerich -

I apologize for not getting a response back to you sooner. In looking through the email string, I think one of the remaining questions is 'where do we go from here'. The options that I know of include:

1. Use the existing process as it currently functions, knowing not all faculty are required to use it and not all validation can/will be done on the D2L side
2. Modify the process to come closer to the Colleague grade validation process knowing that D2L is not a Student Information and does not contain all the information needed to verify grades like Colleague can
3. Discontinue all use of grading integration in D2L
4. Other?

To help understand how we got to this point, below is a timeline summary as it relates to grading integration in D2L.

The Desire2Learn contract became effective August 1, 2007 and included two-way Datatel SIS Integration. One way for courses/users/memberships and the other for grades. August 27th, the D2L and Colleague committees were formed and contacts were sent to ASCC in an effort to elicit help with integration, both courses/users/memberships and grading. On October 23, 2007, SD received SDBOR-WO-001 SIS Integration for a cost of \$40,000. This WO included both course/user/membership and grading integration. Course/user/membership integration was implemented first with input from the universities, both D2L users and Colleague users. A weekly call with the university constituents was set up to discuss the integration. There was also a separate call with D2L.

In mid December 2007, grading integration discussions started. Around January 2, 2008, SD received the attached SDBOR Grades Export Requirements document from D2L. Again, this document was distributed to the universities for review/comment. The grading integration project was split into a separate work order - WO-004, with a revised deadline of May 2008 on PROD. Grading integration was put on hold until courses/users/memberships integration was closer to completion. In late February 2008, after the course/user/membership integration was in the final testing phase, we started the discussions on grading integration once again.

February 25th, 2008, the universities were sent the SDBOR Grades Export Requirements document along with comments from the D2L Technical/Integration committees and were asked to review the document with their university for discussion on the D2L Steering committee call. March 4th, 2008, D2L returned an updated Grades Export Requirements document for our review. The Registrars were also involved with the decisions associated with grading integration. March 20th, 2008, the Datatel programmer was provided with the Grades Export Requirements to begin the process of writing an import process. On April 1st,

2008, SD received the Final Grades Export Requirements document from D2L. This document was disseminated to the D2L and Colleague committees. By May 1st, 2008, we were ready to send a test grading file through. On May 29th, 2008, the Colleague grades import process was ready for testing. The D2L Steering Committee agreed to Pilot the grading integration for Summer 2008 with 8 course offerings. The process was moved to PROD on July 2nd, 2008.

On June 6th, 2008, DSU sent a note to Dave Hansen voicing concerns with D2L grading integration. Some of these concerns led us to the enhancements of the original product. A wish list was started with D2L on June 13th. D2L delivered the Grades Export Additional Features Proposed Solution in August. This was SDBOR-W0007 for a cost of \$4230.00. The changes related to W0007/The Proposed Solution attached were installed in PROD the end of April 2009. Then, in August 2009, another request was sent to D2L regarding more enhancements to Grading Integration. This was the attached W0012 for a cost of \$12840.00. This request was rejected by the D2L Management Committee.

Grading integration has always been optional for universities to use, it has never been mandatory that faculty must use grading integration in D2L. Because D2L is a Learning Management System and not a Student Information System, it does not have all the fields required to validate grades such that WebAdvisor does. In order to provide the validation that WebAdvisor currently does, SD would need to duplicate and maintain many fields in D2L that are currently in Colleague. The email attached titled *DSU - Issues with Grading Function in D2L* shows some examples.

This email got to be wordier than I wanted but hopefully, it provides some background in to the D2L Grading Integration process. If you have more questions or if this was not what you were looking for, please let me know.

Carla Reihe, SDBOR/RIS, System Data Admin, Slagle 030D, Vermillion, SD 57069,
605-677-5035