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1. Introduction

This report contains an overview of the UCLA Common Collaboration and Learning Environment (CCLE) for the academic year 2008–2009, including major milestones, statistical data, user survey results, and near to long term planning data.

CCLE supports education and research for faculty and students within a common digital environment. Based on Moodle, an open source Course Management System (or CMS), CCLE provides the campus with a common platform that includes content, support and training. CCLE’s infrastructure is based on a network of both local and shared Moodle server installations.

Since its pilot implementation in spring quarter 2007, CCLE has quickly shown the potential to develop into a mission-critical, enterprise-level application by more than tripling the number of hosted courses in the last year. Prior to CCLE there were approximately 22 discrete CMS implementations on campus. This count is projected to be 14 by fall 2009. The sense of community and cooperation among participants is very high and has contributed to the rapid growth of CCLE.

CCLE’s has successfully made the transition from a project to a campus system directly supporting education at UCLA. CCLE Home recognizes that there are many aspects of the system that require additional development and improvement. CCLE is a modern Web 2.0 application that must continue to develop and evolve if it is to meet the ever expanding needs and expectations of researchers, faculty, students and staff.

2. Goals and Benefits

CCLE Goals:

- Provide the campus with a robust, easy to use, extendable course and collaboration system;
- Promote shareable innovation and standards-based integration with campus services;
- Maximize the impact of the service across campus by using a combination of shared, central and local services and resources, all driven by community collaboration within UCLA and the Moodle community worldwide.

CCLE Benefits:

- Common platform: reduces the burden on users having to learn multiple systems;
• **Programming efficiencies**: using fewer resources to achieve better results by working from a common code base and shared integration path with data providers;

• **Improved security**: centrally coordinating user authentication and the application of security patches;

• **Interface consistency**: by having participants agree to adhere to Information Architecture best practices;

• **Reduced intellectual property liability**: extending and solidifying the reach of Copyright and Licensing information by giving the widest possible audience a single point of contact in CCLE Home;

• **Common support infrastructure**: training, documentation and local support all benefit from the synergies arising from a common system;

• **Unified presence as a CMS**: enhances UCLA’s reputation as a forerunner in the use of technology-based tools to improve instructional development and collaborative research.

### 3. CCLE Milestones

**2008 – 2009 Academic Year**

- Recruited and hired CCLE Home staff;
- Developed CCLE Privacy notice with Campus Consul and Registrars Office;
- Enabled new modules (user Blogs, Feedback) and features (profile pictures);
- Created process for Open Source contribution to Moodle.org with Campus Copyright and Licensing;
- Gathered requirements for potential projects;
- Evaluated and funded proposals under auspices of the Innovation and Development Program;
- Designed and implemented new hardware architecture;
- Developed an automated Help Request ticketing system;
- Conducted surveys of CCLE students and faculty;
- Completed requirements gathering for near to long term planning;
- Researched and resolved a wide variety of Help Request trouble tickets including those involving the Quiz module and the MyUCLA and Library Reserves blocks;
- Evolved original proposed CCLE budget into a workable budget within Office of Instructional Development;
- Developed CCLE business plan and began a dialog with members of CITI, Vice Chancellor Steve Olsen and members of S&PG on long term funding models for CCLE;
- Continued outreach to other campus units running Moodle.
4. Report from CCLE Home

Staffing
The 2008/2009 academic year in many ways marked the official beginning of CCLE Home. All the previous planning and alpha testing laid the groundwork for building up CCLE Home. Perhaps the greatest achievement in this area was the staffing of all CCLE Home positions. These hires include:

- CCLE Coordinator: Curtis Fornadley (start date 9/9/08)
- Lead Developer: Nick Thompson (start date 3/3/09)
- Support Coordinator: Deborah Kearney (start date 1/20/09)
- Copyright and Licensing Librarian: Martin Brennan (start date 2/2/09)

All new staff members have quickly come up to speed with Moodle and the CCLE collaborative process and have provided a stable, responsive and knowledgeable unit that is able to lead the UCLA CCLE effort.

Growth
This year has served as turning point for CCLE as the number of courses offered in CCLE increased dramatically in Fall Quarter 2008 and continued to increase in winter and spring. The largest contributor to this step in growth was in the Humanities division where CDH completed their migration from Web CT to CCLE Moodle. Other units joining the CCLE shared system this year include the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSEIS), the School of Public Health, the School of Public Affairs, the department of Ethnomusicology, and the department of World Arts & Cultures in the School of Arts and Architecture.

The division of Social Science’s instance of CCLE Moodle saw steady growth over the past year and is now positioned for a full conversion from ClassWeb to CCLE Moodle in fall 2009.

Outreach
Following the implementation of the new CCLE Shared System hardware architecture during Spring break CCLE Home held outreach meetings with several units that are potential future adopters of the CCLE. In all cases the benefits of the IDP program were explained and all individuals were encouraged to submit proposals to help explore the aspects of Moodle that might need to be modified or augmented in order to meet their particular course management needs.

School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (Orachat Chieu and Rex Lorenzo)
The meeting included a demo of the latest version of SEAS accreditation system and Course Web. SEAS will begin exploring Moodle this summer and evaluate the possibility of integrating the SEAS accreditation system with Moodle. SEAS
plans to run a few summer courses on the CCLE Shared System as part of their evaluation of the Moodle interface and functionality.

**School of Medicine** (Anju Relan)
CCLE meet with Anju Relan and her team to review the special CMS needs of the medical school in light of Angel being bought by Blackboard. They seemed interested in learning how Moodle assessment tools compare to Angel and may participate in the Moodle Boot camp offered by CDH and SSC as a way to more fully evaluate the capabilities of Moodle. In addition, there may be an application for mobile Moodle in managing the transfer of patient data to handheld devices used by third year medical students. Their interest in mobile Moodle may result in an IDP proposal.

**Department of Statistics** (Jose Hales-Garcia)
Statistics is a long time user of Moodle and has made extensive use of the Quiz module. This summer CCLE Home will run tests to determine the best way to port the Statistics’ quiz bank to the CCLE Shared System. This is a promising area that could benefit both CCLE and Statistics as more disciplines begin expanding their use of the Quiz module.

**Department of Mathematics** (Edson Smith)
Math is currently using Moodle for its Program in Computing (PIC) courses. They have been waiting for CCLE to reach a level of maturity before transitioning to the CCLE Shared System. They are now ready to move. The goal is to make the transition this summer and be ready to begin hosting courses on the shared system in fall of 2009. Only a few minor changes need to be made to accommodate the move:
- Add the JS-Math module to accommodate the rendering of LaTeX code;
- Make a slight modification to the assignment module.

**Departments of Chemistry** (Peter Xi)
CCLE met with Peter Xi regarding his interest in moving his users onto CCLE. Peter has been developing and hosting his home grown application Virtual Office Hours (VOH) for the past seven years. Peter is interested in moving to CCLE to meet the requests he has been getting for quiz and grading tools which are part of core Moodle application. Peter will be hosting his first course Chemistry 20L on the CCLE Shared System in summer 2009. Peter estimates that it may take up to a full year to move all Chemistry courses from VOH to CCLE. CCLE staff will work with Peter to replicate within CCLE some of the unique features he has developed for VOH including his Q&A service which allows instructors to review questions from students privately and answer selected questions publicly.
**All Hands Meetings**
CCLE Home hosts an “All Hands” meeting twice a year. These meetings provide the opportunity for the whole CCLE community to come together and review progress, share experiences and discuss current needs and future directions. The fall meeting was held on Nov 17, 2008. The next meeting is scheduled for June 29, 2009.

**Planning and Budget**
During the preparation of the 2008-2009 CCLE status report to the Committee on IT Infrastructure (CITI) it became clear that the CCLE project had entered its operational phase. This transition from a campus pilot to a major campus system happened faster than expected. CCLE has emerged as a modern web 2.0 application that is largely operations, but which has ongoing project development components. The "project" aspects moving forward can be regarded as improvements and enhancements. Because of this transition to operations it became clear to CITI that an ongoing business model would have to be developed to make CCLE sustainable over the long term. To this end CITI requested that the status document be presented as a business plan including CCLE’s operational costs and growth projections out to 2012. This plan, presented to CITI April 2009, now provides a platform for discussing and developing a funding model.

**5. Reports from CCLE Subgroups**

**Standards and Practice Group (S&PG)**
The Standards and Practice Group (S&PG), serves as the main governance body of CCLE, setting overall priorities and direction. The members of this group represent schools and divisions which have opted-in to CCLE or are interested in actively following the direction and progress of CCLE for possible active participation in the future. Vincent Riggs has acted as the S&PG chair for the 2008-2009 fiscal year. The S&PG meets on the first Tuesday of every month. Over the past year the S&PG has:
- Defined the guidelines for the CCLE innovation and development program;
- Nominated and selected the IDP review committee;
- Actively worked to resolve student privacy issues within CCLE;
- Reviewed and approved the design and implementation of a new hardware architecture for the shared system;
- Reviewed and approved the CCLE business plan in support of the CITI budget review;
- Begun discussion on long term funding scenarios;
- Selected Annelie Rugg, Ph.D. Director/Humanities CIO as the new S&PG chair for FY 09-10.
**Common Interest Group (CIG)**

The Common Interest Group (CIG) is an active working group, meeting weekly, that reports directly to S&PG. There are several members that participate in both groups. CIG must constantly balance immediate needs and issues that arise with near to long term planning.

CIG monitors operations of the shared system, the course building process and other routine tasks that must be completed, especially at the beginning and end of each term. CIG manages the communication with CCLE users and determines the timetable for planned down times and provides action plans for unplanned outages.

When necessary, CIG helps to prioritize the work of the Developers, Functionality and System Operations subgroups. CIG provides direction on issues that involve policy, setting of precedent, or impact future scalability. In most cases CIG will review changes to the user interface, usability changes and content presented to CCLE users on the home page. When necessary, CIG will conduct a simple majority vote. Some of the issues CIG managed this past year include:

- Approved the upgrade to Moodle 1.9.2
- Coordinated agreement with campus intellectual property to allow CCLE to contribute back to Moodle.org
- Facilitated adding the Privacy notice to all CCLE pages
- Approved restoring the user Blog function in CCLE Moodle
- Approved allowing users to change Moodle profile images

CIG participated in a lengthy requirements gathering exercise to inform near term and long term planning that resulted in the first CCLE “Features and Functionality Matrix” (FFM) The matrix will be used to group and prioritize tasks which can then be turned into phased projects for CCLE. The FFM can also be used by the IDP committee when assessing the relative value of future IDP proposals.

**System Operations Group (Sys Ops)**

The Systems Operations group (Sys Ops) is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and scaling of the CCLE shared system hardware as well as network, database and system configuration for the system. The group expanded this spring and now also serves as an advisory group to the broader CCLE community interested in hosting their own CCLE Moodle instances. Sys Ops meet as a group once a week but must monitor the shared systems and respond to issues on continuous basis through out the year. Sys Ops actively seeks to discover and implement ways to make error detection proactive and ways to make the system self healing.

The CCLE shared system suffered one major outage during the year. On Thursday 12/18/08 at 5:11 PM ccle.ucla.edu went down because of a power interruption in the MSA Data Center as the result of DWP work being performed. The surge triggered a
hard failure in the VMWare cluster architecture for the CCLE production server. The shared system was restored to service at 10:00 PM Friday 12/19/08. The lessons learned from this outage resulted in steps to prevent this type of failure from happening again.

1) CCLE purchased a rack based UPS as a back up for the building UPS
2) A new and much simplified hardware architecture was developed and deployed (3/25/09) focusing on proven commodity technologies and skills. This included moving the production server off of a Virtual machine and on to a dedicated Linux server. The Moodle database was moved to a dedicated server, separate from the web/application server. In order to improve system performance the CCLE MySQL database was converted from a MYISAM format to the INNODB format which allows for row level locking as opposed to table level locking. This summer the database server will be configured for replication to a dedicated secondary database server. On June 17, 2009 the Windows based iSCSI connection and SAN, hosting the Moodle user files, was replaced by an actively managed storage system know as the Blue Arc, hosted at the IDRE Research data center on campus. This will allow for storage of Moodle user files as well as “warm” backups of the system and will have a direct connection to the TSM tape robot backup system. Performance, reliability, and storage scalability will be greatly improved with the Blue Arc system.

Following the deployment of the new production hardware architecture an identical STAGE system was built, thus completing proper system architecture: TEST, STAGE and PROD server environments. In case of a severe hardware failure on PROD, the STAGE environment can be deployed as PROD within four hours.

CCLE was asked to prepare a system scaling model with growth projections out to 2012 as part of this year’s report to CITI. This model includes strategies such as clustering the web and database servers are detailed in a 5 year cost model of a scaled system projection. This model can be viewed in Appendix A.

During the development of the CCLE business plan and the first official CCLE budget under OID, the original CCLE planning document was reviewed. The original budget planned for 25% of a System Administrator, per instance of Moodle. According to the original budget this was an in-kind contribution by ATS/OIT and not paid directly out of the CCLE budget. Since then the experience of running the CCLE campus system over the past year has demonstrated that this estimate was too low. As department participation increases in the CCLE shared system, so will the level of service expected. The working CCLE budget now reflects funding for a full-time PAIII with 50% of the funding coming from ATS/OIT so that the CCLE can have one dedicated system administrator.

In the coming year Sys Ops will be actively involved in developing archival scenarios to present to CIG and S&PG to address long term management of CCLE data.
Developers Group (DEV)

Over the past year, the development team has gone through a significant growth and re-structuring. Slobodan ‘Jova’ Jovic, the acting CCLE lead developer left the university in September 2009. The CCLE Coordinator Curtis Fornadley led development efforts until the current lead developer Nick Thompson was hired on March 2nd 2009. The Developers group is very active and meets for 2 hours weekly. Members of this group include representatives from the Office of Instructional Development, Social Sciences Computing, Humanities, Nursing, and Academic Technical Services. We look forward to bringing in more active members from other departments currently evaluating Moodle and new any members interested in shaping the future of CCLE and Moodle.

During this past year significant efforts have been made to streamline and fine-tune development work in order to increase the overall efficiency of the development group. An example of this strategy is the implementation of a procedure for new developers to quickly come up to speed by using free tools such as the Netbeans integrated development environment (IDE), the XAMPP local web server and the SVN source code repository.

Another important tool used extensively by CCLE in this process is JIRA, a "browser-based bug, issue, task and defect tracking system." JIRA enables CCLE to establish workflow procedures and to facilitate high quality code review of all development work serving as the central knowledge base for individual and collaborative development work. JIRA was also central to the design of the new CCLE Support Help Request system. JIRA will soon be the exclusive tool used by Support to handle all technical issues that relate to CCLE. Lastly, JIRA is used for collaboration between other CCLE subgroups such as CIG, and Functionality.

Development projects completed this year include:

1. **Public/Private Capability:** This project involved the development of functionality that allowed instructors to set the security of their files on a granular level. Prior to the development of this feature all materials within a course had to be either open to everyone, or only open to members of that course, however now that security setting can be made for each individual resource. Currently members of the development team are preparing to package up this feature and submit it back to the open source community.

2. **Automating Course Creation and Population:** This development involved the automation of course creation, populating the newly created courses with students, and reconciling changes in enrollment status (dropping/adding activity) in a manner that is transparent to users (instructors/students). With the implementation of this feature, local support can now take advantage of an easy-to-use request form to create individual classes or to request course builds for an entire category of courses. Each course is then automatically populated and synced with Registrar data so that any changes in enrollment or assignment (if a student drops, or professor switches), the changes will be automatically reflected within the CCLE course site. This dual-pronged feature is a major selling point to departments considering the adoption of CCLE.
3. **Enhanced Security Features:** In response to restrictions mandated by the FERPA guidelines, the CCLE developers worked to guarantee that student information is only shared with classmates. These changes made it possible for the reintroduction of features previously deactivated due to security concerns (User Blogs, Profile Pictures).

4. **Implementation of the CCLE Support Help Request System:** As the result of a “needs analysis” conducted by the combined Functionality/Support subgroup, CCLE developers created a ticketing system that leverages JIRA and its web services API to assign tickets to the Support personnel responsible for a particular class or department. This ticketing system will enable the CCLE Support infrastructure to scale to the entire university. The new Support Help Request System is currently being tested in a few summer courses on a volunteer basis and is scheduled to be included in all course builds for fall, 2009.

The CCLE Developer Group has a full plate with many new projects on the horizon including:
- Improving the workflow within SVN in keeping with industry best practices;
- Contributing successful development code back to the Moodle.org open source community;
- Integrating the Moodle gradebook with the MyUCLA gradebook;
- Integrating user interface improvements proposed by the User Interface subgroup;
- Modifying existing features and researching the implementation of new modules to enable further adoption of CCLE by campus units;
- Improving reports and scheduled statistics and reports from within CCLE Moodle.

**Functionality and Support Groups**
In the fall of 2008 the Functionality and Support subgroups merged into one subgroup meeting for an hour and a half each week. Members regularly addressed user support concerns and investigated the ways in which Moodle functionality could respond to these issues. Although the decision to combine the two subgroups was initially one of expediency, specifically the need to maximize available resources until a Support Coordinator could be hired, members felt that the partnership was productive since the focus and goals of the two groups were largely complementary.

As CCLE Home is now fully staffed and as the number of departments, divisions and schools opting-in to the CCLE Share System continue to grow, it is time to pursue CCLE’s standing goal to build and maintain a knowledgeable and engaged support team that can serve as an example of cross department collaboration for the entire campus. Toward that end the CCLE Support Coordinator in conjunction with the CDH ITC Coordinator plan to reconstitute the subgroups as separate entities during summer 2009.

**Functionality**
Functionality has reviewed/revised and approved the following modules for production:
• User Blog
• Feedback Module
• Improvements to Quiz Module – specifically the feedback component

Support
The CCLE Support team is comprised of the members listed in Appendix C, local CCLE support staff, and an active and indispensable group of ITCs from the Center of Digital Humanities. Interacting with users (faculty, students and staff) on a daily basis, this group is responsible for fielding questions that range from course build requests to uploading files for the less technically experienced CCLE faculty members. CCLEhelp email (which was the central but not the only channel for help requests prior to the implementation of the Help Request system) regularly receives over 1000 messages per quarter. Support staff responsibilities also include preparing the system for a new term by creating new subcategories, requesting courses, cross-listing courses, compiling the list of support assignments for cross-listed courses, moving courses from the previous term to the appropriate sub categories.

Current and completed projects
• Test and reconfigure the CCLE system to ensure compliance with student privacy regulations. Rigorously tested the CCLE Shared System on a feature-by-feature basis to ensure that the public/private functionality was in place and working as designed.
• Replace the email-based help system with an automated help request or ticketing system. The CCLEhelp email box and the associated ccle-support listserv have served as the primary repository for users’ questions, comments and complaints since CCLE’s inception. Although this strategy was sustainable when CCLE was in its Alpha phase, it rapidly proved unwieldy as more units opted in and the routing and tracking of help requests became more complicated. Working with the Developers Group, Support mapped the “best case” trajectory for support requests and provided valuable input into the design of an automated help request system now available on the CCLE Production server.
• Redesign the format, structure and functionality of the CCLE help site to improve the delivery and scalability of online support. The deliverables for this project included:
  o Reconfiguring the user interface by incorporating a “less is more” strategy that gives users the information they need in an intuitive, easy to navigate environment;
  o Giving CCLE users (faculty, students and staff) multiple pathways to access information based upon their level of expertise, browsing expectations and self-identified role;
  o Identifying, implementing and modifying (if necessary) a Moodle module that would serve as a single source repository or “book of record” for support documentation;
  o Reviewing, revising and cataloguing existing support documentation.
• Create and deploy a large-scale test plan that would give CCLE Support staff a tool with which to assess application functionality via the user interface on a role-
by-role basis. The plan was used successfully during the CCLE hardware upgrade in March, 2009.

- **Research, evaluate and recommend revisions to the standard CCLE/Moodle interface.** This project will build upon the work currently being done by SSC as part of a CCLE IDP. The proposed user interface and functional modifications will be evaluated by a newly-formed User Interface subgroup.

- **Develop the specifications for a CCLE Brochure site** that will serve as the access point for new students, faculty and staff as well as the general user. The design for the site has been approved by CIG and is currently in development.

6. **Statistics**

A series of quantitative reports and statistics for the 2008-2009 academic year are presented below. The metrics used in this report were selected by CCLE home and CIG. In some cases the item requested were not available because the corresponding data was not being captured. Such cases have resulted in tasks for technical staff so that we may begin capturing the required data starting in summer 2009. The following data is included to provide useful historical context to this report:

**Historical Overview**

Number of different course management systems on campus

- Feb 2006: 22
- Feb 2009: 15
- Fall 2009 (projected): 14

**Total Courses in CCLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Course sites</th>
<th>Collaboration Sites</th>
<th>Inactive Course sites</th>
<th>Inactive Collab Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 09</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 09</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Course site** – any course prefixed with YYT

**Collaboration site** - any course that is not prefixed with YYT and is under the Collaboration category;

**Inactive Course sites** – any course site that has not had a single page view since the first week of the course;

**Inactive Collaboration Site** – any collaboration site that has not had a single page view in the 6 months prior to when the query is run.

**Hits**

In the past, this site data (hits per day, hits per month, hits per year) has not been collected, so we are unable to report on it at this time. We have since identified this flaw in our statistics gathering and have begun collecting this data. As of the next annual report, this data will be available, and presented.

---

**User Data**

![User Data Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of Students</th>
<th>Total number of instructors</th>
<th>Total number of users</th>
<th>Unique logins a day</th>
<th>Unique logins per week</th>
<th>Unique logins per Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 08</strong></td>
<td>15136</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>15606</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>8500</td>
<td>15033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter 09</strong></td>
<td>17388</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>18001</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>10700</td>
<td>17539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 09</strong></td>
<td>18170</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>18959</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>10857</td>
<td>18347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student - a participant with at least 1 student role in any Course Site as defined above.
Instructor - a participant with at least 1 instructor role in any Course Site as defined above.
Users - the total number of people with any role in any Course Site as defined above. It is important to recognize that the total number of unique students added to the total number of unique instructors does not equal the sum of all users because users may be assigned multiple roles simultaneously. This aggregate is further complicated by the number of role types available to the user within the Moodle framework (guest, non-editing instructor, course creator are a representative few).
Unique logins - unique logins per username, not IP address.

Storage Reports
In the past, this data was not collected for all quarters, so we are unable to report past quarters at this time. We have since identified this flaw in our statistics gathering and have begun collecting this data. As of the next annual report, this data will be available, and presented.

Storage Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total size of file data</td>
<td>446 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total size of Moodle database</td>
<td>6.3GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Files larger than 1MB</td>
<td>19298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Downloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downloads</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Winter 09</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Downloads</td>
<td>575,966.00</td>
<td>573,556.00</td>
<td>555,968.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bandwidth</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>doc</th>
<th>docx</th>
<th>exe</th>
<th>gif</th>
<th>jpeg</th>
<th>jpg</th>
<th>pdf</th>
<th>png</th>
<th>ppt</th>
<th>rtf</th>
<th>tif</th>
<th>tiff</th>
<th>txt</th>
<th>xls</th>
<th>xlsx</th>
<th>xml</th>
<th>zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File Counts</td>
<td>23366</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6889</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>33828</td>
<td>24903</td>
<td>3371</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>2089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>mov</th>
<th>mp3</th>
<th>mp4</th>
<th>mpeg</th>
<th>mpg</th>
<th>swf</th>
<th>wav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File Counts</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>2960</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category (School, Division and Department) data

Total Courses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Subject Area</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Winter 09</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric &amp; Oceanic Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Space Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Information Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Applied Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Alpert School of Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Affairs</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Inactive Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Subject Area</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Winter 09</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric &amp; Oceanic Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Space Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Information Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Applied Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Alpert School of Music</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Subject Area</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Winter 09</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric &amp; Oceanic Sciences</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Space Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Information Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Applied Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Alpert School of Music</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>11245</td>
<td>12501</td>
<td>11981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>3035</td>
<td>3059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Affairs</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Courses** - Total number of course sites as defined above that are under one of the subcategories of the Courses parent category

**Inactive Courses** – Courses that have not had a single page hit after the first week of class

**Users** - Total number of people that have had any role in any course site in the specified category.
Unique Instants of Activity Modules per Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity module</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Winter 09</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg # threads</strong></td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg # posters</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORM/AICC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wik</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimba Voice Tool</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Resource Modules**

* Values are presented on a logarithmic scale

**Unique Instants of Resource Modules per Term**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Winter 09</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>8651</td>
<td>11001</td>
<td>11926</td>
<td>4347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Unique Instants of Blocks per Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocks</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Winter 09</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>activity_modules</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admin</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blog_menu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blog_tags</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calendar_month</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calendar_upcoming</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course_list</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course_menu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course_summary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glossary_random</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>html</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>messages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news_items</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online_users</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recent_activity</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rss_client</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search_forums</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tags</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bvoicerecorder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course_menu</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libraryreserves</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myucla</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ucla_links</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elluminate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity Reports

Hits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic by number of hits</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Winter 09</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Active Course</td>
<td>Mus Hist 5 Hist-Rock and Roll</td>
<td>Hebrew 1B Elementary Hebrew</td>
<td>Classic 30 Classical Mythology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Active Discipline</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course using the most space on disk</td>
<td>African 12A Intermediate Yoruba</td>
<td>ESL 39B Communication Strategies</td>
<td>AP&amp;TESL Foreign Language Teaching Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of topics in a given Moodle course</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of hits the help course receives</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of courses that deviate from the default theme</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive Course sites</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive Collab Sites</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other
The two most active collaborative sites:
- CCLE Subgroups Site with 205 Video Furnace Links and 665 picture changes.
- UCLA Sefer Ezer (Sherman)

Most Active Course - Course with the most total number of page views
Most Active Discipline - Discipline with the most number of page views per participant

Social Science Computing (SSC): Site and User Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Course sites</th>
<th>Collaboration Sites</th>
<th>Total number of Students</th>
<th>Total number of instructors</th>
<th>Total number of users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter 09</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 09</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4066</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CCLE Innovation and Development Program (IDP) seeks to encourage innovative CCLE enhancements at UCLA, including new Moodle tools and services that can be contributed to the Moodle community. The Innovation and Development Program is vital to the success of the CCLE as it encourages the innovations that will make CCLE a thriving application that will continue to grow in usefulness and thus drive adoption. Without this program all development, enhancements and innovation would fall solely on the CCLE lead developer and whatever “volunteer” developer time was available on campus. In practical terms, the growth and evolution of CCLE would be drastically slowed without the Innovation and Development Program.

The members of the IDP Selection Committee for calendar year 2009 are:

- Roger Bourland, Professor and Chair, Music
- Troy Carter, Associate Professor, Physics and Astronomy
- Curtis Fornadley, CCLE Coordinator (non-voting member)
- Mike Kusunoki, Director, Anderson Computing & Information Services
- Vincent Riggs, Director, School of Public Affairs Computing and Chair of the CCLE S&PG

Under the guidelines set out by the S&PG the CCLE IDP selection committee completed its first review and funding of large proposals. The first call for proposals closed 3/13/2009 and resulted in 11 proposals amounting to $283,330.18. The budget for FY 08-09 was $186,000. In April 2009 the following proposals received CCLE IDP funding:

**Elluminate Virtual Classroom/Meeting Pilot**
This proposal seeks to provide for the entire UCLA campus, a one year pilot and evaluation of a Moodle integrated version of the browser based virtual classroom/meeting software known as Elluminate Live. This would be the second part of a two part pilot project. The first phase is a limited user pilot funded by OID and OIT that will focus primarily on integration, administration and cost sharing scenarios.

**Asian Languages and Cultures (ALC) Language Placement**
This proposal explores using Moodle to automate the process of placing new students in foreign language courses. “We need to develop on-line procedures for managing enrollments in foreign-language courses. While focused on our immediate needs, we aim to develop on-line tools that could be implemented by (or serve as a model for) other foreign language departments at UCLA. Our staff and/or faculty are willing to work with other interested departments to insure that the Moodle components meet their needs as well as ours.”

**MyUCLA Gradebook Integration**
The Office of Undergraduate Education Information Technology (UIT) requests funding for a project to link the Moodle gradebook feature provided by the new Common Collaborative Learning Environment (CCLE) with MyUCLA’s Gradebook. UIT believes the results of this collaboration can establish the seamless and
transparent user experience envisioned for CCLE. Currently CCLE has no mechanism for displaying the contents of a Moodle gradebook outside of the Moodle interface. UIT proposes to integrate MyUCLA’s Gradebook with the Moodle gradebook in three phases. The first phase would ensure that intra-term grades entered into the Moodle gradebook are accessible to counselors via Counselor Desktop and to students via MyUCLA. Phase 2 will involve a more thorough integration to reverse the flow of data to Moodle and ensure accurate and secure transmission of any intra-term grades entered into MyUCLA’s Gradebook.

UCLA Library Moodle Widget
UCLA Library Moodle Widget is being developed to provide a contextualized library information source within Moodle courses. The goal of the UCLA Library Moodle Widget is to sharpen the focus of the resources particular to the course context. This means getting the most precise information resources for the course, closer to the students, and easily accessible.

Proposal to Enhance the CCLE Shared Moodle System
As the campus gains more experience with the use of Moodle to offer course management materials and the CCLE consortium receives increased feedback from faculty and student users, it has become clear that the interface of the current shared system should be redesigned to improve usability and increase user satisfaction. Social Sciences Computing (SSC) is proposing the creation, modification, or integration of several important improvements for the shared system. These improvements include:
  o A control panel for common tasks, include a simplified file upload tool
  o Simplify the “look” of class (course) pages
  o Redesign of the CCLE Moodle home page (simple and intuitive means to search for their courses.)

CCLE Video Playback and Analysis
Digital Civic Learning requested funding to support the development of a video embedding and analysis tool for the CCLE. The tool will be an integrated Moodle plugin, available to students, instructors, and researchers through the UCLA's CCLE site, and designed from the ground up to be portable across Moodle deployments. The plugin is intended to allow instructors “one-click” embedding of online video using a consistent player interface. For instructors wanting a more interactive experience, the plugin will allow instructors to build video analysis in their course projects and assignments, and faculty and their assistants to code video material for research projects using existing Moodle database elements. Reports generated by the plugin will also be suitable for a wide variety of uses, from simply verifying which students viewed the assigned video, to more detailed sharing and exports of content analysis metadata or tags.

CCLE Moodle Course Readiness Camps
This proposal will help fund the first in what we hope will be a regular schedule of intensive CCLE Course Readiness Camps (CRCs) during summers and quarterly
intercessions. The purpose of the CRCs is to offer instructors who are completely new to CCLE some dedicated consulting support hours from proficient CCLE/Moodle instructional-design staff available through the Center for Digital Humanities (CDH) and Social Sciences Computing (SSC). The CCLE CRCs will serve as an “onboarding” program for any instructor in any opted-in unit needing help getting one or more course(s) onto CCLE/Moodle. Though staff will work out of CDH and SSC, they will work with any eligible instructor. Instructors will be eligible if (a) they are teaching the relevant courses in the coming academic year, and (b) they are from an opted-in unit but have not yet used either the shared or the local CCLE/Moodle systems for instruction.

Adding Audio Playback to the Hebrew E-Workbook
The Hebrew E-Workbook, the first project at UCLA to adapt the CCLE Moodle’s Quiz Tool, offers for the first time for the instruction of Hebrew as a foreign language a full year of systematic and intensive online teaching and practice of Hebrew grammar. Building on this improvement, a one-year project has been proposed to enhance the Hebrew E-Workbook through the addition of an audio playback feature, for developing student oral skills. This feature is available within Moodle, but has not been tested before at UCLA. An improved E-Workbook would benefit many Hebrew students and could serve as a model for other languages.

The proposals for these funded projects are open for review at:
http://ccle.ucla.edu/course/view/CCLE_Grants

Moving Forward
The next call for CCLE IDP proposals began on June 17, 2009, and will remain open until October 1, 2009.

8. Copyright and Licensing initiatives
CCLE Home and the UCLA Library hired Martin Brennan as the CCLE Copyright and Licensing Librarian in February of 2009. The Copyright Librarian’s central agenda is to deliver focused, customized group instruction and/or one-on-one consultation, to faculty and those assisting them in CCLE site development, on issues such as:

- Course Management Systems and Copyright
  - Rights and Responsibilities of Instructors and Students
  - Course Reserves, Coursepacks and other delivery options for materials licensed by the library
  - Explaining Public Domain
  - Determining Fair Use of Copyrighted Materials
  - Obtaining Permissions (when necessary)
- Protecting your own Copyrighted materials
  - UC Policies on Ownership of Faculty Work
  - Using Creative Commons licensing to share materials in a targeted manner
Within the library, the Copyright Librarian works with Digital Collections Services (DCS), under the direction of Sharon Farb, the Associate University Librarian for Collection Management and Scholarly Communication. DCS, in coordination with the UCLA Library’s Scholarly Communication Steering Committee, plans and delivers targeted seminars, instruction and outreach to faculty, students and staff on topics such as:

- Course Management Systems and Copyright
- Faculty Rights as an Author / Understanding Your Publisher
- NIH Public Access Policy
- UC Policies on Ownership of Faculty Work
- Teaching Students about Copyright and Academic Integrity
- Patents, Software, and Open Source
- Using eScholarship to Store and Preserve Data, Published (or Unpublished) Research, and much more

Though such efforts are targeted to all groups regardless of opt-in to CCLE, the Copyright Librarian brings a CCLE focus and perspective to such efforts, and reiterates the value of his services and the rest of CCLE Home to those departments who opt-in to CCLE.

Outreach efforts have already included a handful of Faculty, Deans, and CCLE local support groups, and will systematically reach out to all Faculty from departments opted into CCLE. The teaching materials developed for this effort will also be added to the CCLE Help Site and the UCLA Library website.

CCLE is currently coordinating with the UCLA library to post a general Copyright Notice, which will link on the footer of every CCLE page. Additionally, a more concise Copyright Warning will be integrated into all pages and forms related to uploading materials onto CCLE. This work should be completed by the end of June 2009.

As capabilities expand with future iterations of Moodle, more detailed tracking of Copyright status for individual documents, audio and visual files, and other learning objects should become possible. Key groups in CCLE, the UCLA Library, and Campus Counsel will coordinate to craft a metadata scheme and protocol that will help CCLE users track their copyright decisions down to the item level, which will lead to greater focus of outreach and training needs.

Additionally, these groups are systematically reviewing all conduits for the delivery of course materials, including the functionalities of CCLE itself, and other campus units that channel content through CCLE, including but not limited to:

- UCLA Library e-reserves
- Instructional Media Lab’s streaming video service
- UCLA Music Library’s streaming audio reserves
The goal of such examination of each of these delivery methods is to gain mastery of the full variety of delivery options available to Faculty through CCLE, and work with these external units to insure that Copyright and Licensing concerns are handled in an optimal manner whenever possible.

9. Assessing Student and Faculty Needs

One of the key design principles outlined in the original CCLE planning document (see “Implementing Infrastructure and Community: Planning the Next Phase of the UCLA Common Collaboration and Learning Environment”) laid particular emphasis upon the role that faculty and student experience must play in determining the direction of any common campus course management system if it is to be a success. The CCLE governance structure was urged to look to “faculty and student advisory groups” for this information in addition to a more “formal assessment” of the target populations. CCLE Home has taken the following steps toward the realization of this critical goal

Formation of Advisory Groups

**Faculty:** The CCLE Coordinator presented an overview of the CCLE project to the Faculty Committee on Educational Technology (FCET) in January of 2009 and requested that the FCET take the role of the CCLE Faculty Advisory group during the preliminary stages of this project. The FCET agreed to assume the role as defined by CCLE’s governance model.

The group’s initial observations focused on improvements to the CCLE interface, the need for increased integration with other campus applications, the importance of further research into tools specific to collaboration and research, as well as suggestions for how the delivery of support materials could be made more effectively.

**Student:** In order to create effective and proactive student advisory groups, CCLE used the CCLE Student Survey to canvas UCLA students who had enrolled in at least one course administered by CCLE during the current academic year. In what was otherwise an anonymous survey students were asked to provide contact information if they were willing to participate in a follow-up focus group. Over fifty students volunteered. The way in which the feedback from these groups will be leveraged within the larger model of CCLE governance has yet to be determined, but at the very least their input will serve to validate or qualify the results garnered from the online surveys.

Implementation of Online Surveys

The type of formal assessment available through online surveys was another potential source of valuable information about “faculty and student experience and needs” identified in the CCLE planning document cited above. A small team comprised of the CCLE Support Coordinator and the Copyright and Licensing Librarian researched a variety of survey tools including one hosted by SurveyMonkey and another by MyUCLA. Ultimately the tool chosen was CCLE’s own recently activated Feedback module which offered the advantages of scalability and security.
Whenever possible the survey team used similar guidelines to inform the structure and content of the two surveys. For example, there were approximately the same ratio of multiple choice to open-text questions in each survey, and both had questions regarding the system’s usability, functionality and reliability (see example below).

Finally, drafts of the survey tools were distributed to the CCLE subgroups (S&PG and CIG, in particular) for feedback and final approval.

**CCLE Student Survey Spring 2009**

The CCLE Student Survey was launched on May 11, 2009, and closed on the last day of the spring term, June 12. During that five week period 820 students submitted survey results. Participants were asked to respond to 8 multiple-choice and 6 open text questions. A complete list of the text responses for each of the open-ended questions is available in Appendix B of this report.

**Overview**

Student responses to our user survey were generally favorable, though comments came in across the spectrum of complimentary to critical. In positive terms, greater than 90% of students appreciated having course materials available 24/7 through a centralized location, more than 80% found CCLE “easy to use,” and over 60% rated their overall experience with CCLE as “Good” or “Excellent.” Some representative positive comments:

- “I really like having the ability to access all of my materials on this interface, and I also love being able to interact with other students who are taking this course. It has proven most helpful!”
- “The CCLE is a very useful tool, especially when professors take full advantage of its potential. Being able to access course materials is a great advantage.”
- “Great feature that enhances the educational experience of students.”

In critical terms, a consistent theme emerged regarding students’ perceived misuse or underutilization of CCLE by the teaching faculty. Students want more faculty to use CCLE, and wants greater utilization by those who already use it. Encouraging further faculty buy-in to CCLE, more than 60% found it important or very important that their “courses at UCLA have the same interface and use the same tools.” Some sample comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>3. Do you find CCLE easy to use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Very Difficult (0):</td>
<td>7 (5.07 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Difficult (1)</td>
<td>39 (28.26 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Easy (2)</td>
<td>74 (53.62 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very Easy (3):</td>
<td>12 (8.70 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average:</strong> 1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>10. Do you find CCLE easy to use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Very Difficult (0):</td>
<td>7 (0.85 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Difficult (1)</td>
<td>77 (9.39 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Easy (2)</td>
<td>505 (60.80 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very Easy (3):</td>
<td>103 (12.56 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average:</strong> 1.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• “CCLE is useful but it depends on how much the instructors got involved.”
• “Professors should post more information on CCLE and encourage students to discuss on CCLE too.”
• “I wish that more classes used CCLE!”

There was also much feedback on the functionality of the system, regarding login issues, problems with PDF downloading, and interface design issues, providing lots of suggestions for ongoing future development of the interface and its features. Additionally, a handful of perception problems emerged, suggesting CCLE could better market and explain its system and mission to students. Students perceived that they pay too much for the system, even though their fees do no support it, and very few knew what the acronym CCLE stand for. Moreover, this savvy community of web users retains high expectations for interface usability, and expects CCLE to keep up with the latest in interface design. Fortunately, a high number volunteered to participate in focus groups, which will allow us to leverage this interest and garner more input from students in further development over the coming year.

CCLE Faculty Survey Spring 2009
The CCLE Survey for faculty was available from May 18 through June 19. During that period over 138 instructors submitted survey results out of the 1609 who were invited to participate via email and a MyUCLA notification. Participants were asked to respond to 16 questions, four of which were open-ended. A complete list of the text responses for each of the open-ended questions is available in Appendix B of this report.

Overview
When asked for their feedback about CCLE, the response of UCLA’s diverse faculty was predictably mixed. While some were enthusiastic about the positive effects technology had on their classrooms, others were quick to point out the downside, with one instructor noting: “Students tend to write like they're texting, which is not helpful in an English class.” A few even questioned the wisdom of relying on a CMS to deliver course materials when the usefulness of the system is “dependent on servers staying up.”

The majority, however, agreed on the value of having course materials accessible to both students and faculty from anywhere a network connection was available:

• “I really like having a central location where my students can find answers to questions, course material, other support materials (like image databases, URLs, etc.) …. My students can no longer complain that they couldn't find something or access materials.”
• “Availability to students at any time…allows me to revise syllabi and other course materials as needed.”
• “I can grade anywhere and everything is always in one place.”

Cost savings – both tangible (“avoids costs of readers,” “it saves them [students] money”) and intangible (“reduces paper waste,” “cuts down on the use of paper,” “save on paper/trees”) was another common theme.
The feature most frequently criticized by faculty was the CCLE interface. Comments ranged from “Moodle is ugly!” to “the most atrocious examples of user interface design I have ever seen,” and “it seems to have been designed by techies with little to no thought about a clean, functional appearance.” When asked what feature should be considered a priority for CCLE in the near future, one respondent suggested “get a GUI designer” and another that “developers…take design courses.” There were some, however, who expressed interest in taking a proactive approach:

“A new interface design using focus groups for testing. And, blind testing by new users. What this means is, turn a few users loose on the interface and see what they tell you: where are they confused? What didn't work as THEY expected it to work.”

**Interesting finds:**

- When asked to name the “most significant advantages of using CCLE,” over a third of the respondents specifically praised the “site organization” and overall “ease of use.” When asked to name the “most significant disadvantages of using CCLE,” a similar number of respondents complained about the “poor organization” and the “level of technology” needed to use the system.
- Over half of the faculty respondents rated their skill level with CCLE course tools as “intermediate” or “expert” and expressed no desire to be trained on how to better use CCLE.
- 85% of the survey participants have at least one full year’s of experience using course management tools (see below)

![Bar Chart](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 term or less</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 terms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer than 3 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

Clearly a common theme in the feedback received from advisory groups and survey participants is that the user interface needs to be improved. As a first step in rectifying this problem CCLE will create a User Interface subgroup to serve as a taskforce responsible for improving this area of the system. We hope to recruit new qualified campus collaborators who are experienced in graphic design and information architecture. If this talent cannot be found on campus, S&PG will evaluate options for issuing an RFP for these services. Of equal importance will be securing the active input of our focus groups (faculty and student) during the development and testing phases of the new interface.
10. Requirements Gathering and Planning

Everyone involved in CCLE recognizes that there are many aspects of the service that require additional development and improvement. Modern information technology services must evolve or become irrelevant. This is true for CCLE and Moodle; they must change and grow to meet the ever expanding needs of users. Because of this CCLE must engage in a regular planning process.

CCLE is taking a three-pronged approach to requirements gathering which will consist of eliciting feedback from representatives of the CCLE Governance Structure (members of the Common Interest Group and the Standards and Practices Group) as well as the faculty and students who have used the CCLE Shared System.

Over the past 6 months CIG identified requirements that they viewed as most important in order to make CCLE “ready for prime time” for the entire campus. These requirements were mapped into a “Features and Functionality Matrix” which placed items into one of sixteen major feature and functionality categories. The “Features and Functionality Matrix” is a 2-3 year planning tool used to prioritize and group tasks that can then be turned into phased projects for CCLE. Some of these tasks are already in progress. It can also be used by the IDP committee when assessing the relative value of future IDP proposals [as a “needs” tool for the IDP committee when evaluating future IDP proposals.]

CIG and S&PG have been asked to assign a “value” rating to each item. The CCLE Developers group has reviewed the matrix and assigned a level of technical difficulty to each item in the matrix. These results will be aggregated and presented to CIG and S&PG in July 2009.

The other two “prongs” are represented by the quantitative and qualitative input received from the student and faculty surveys previously discussed in this report. In fall 2009 the results of the faculty survey will be reviewed by FCET, the acting CCLE Faculty Advisory Group. Students that volunteered in the student survey will serve as the Student Advisory Group and will be asked to review and comment on the results of the CCLE Student Survey.

The results of faculty and student input will be overlaid with the “Features and Functionality Matrix,” to identify areas of agreement and divergence with regard to “value.” This information will inform scheduling and prioritizations of work as CCLE moves forward. It is anticipated that a reassessment of requirements will be done on an annual basis so that we can fine-tune our direction and concentration of resources.
The projected CCLE budget for 2009-10 is roughly $900,000.00. What is not represented in this number is the in-kind contribution of staff across all units. An estimate of this value is presented in the original 5 year cost analysis. We believe it would be very difficult to derive an accurate measure of contributed cost assigned directly to CCLE. The amount of effort would result in little value and would contain many assumptions that would be difficult to verify.

UCLA faces difficult economic times during which many important funding decisions will have to be made. Among these decisions will be how to fund CCLE over the long term.

The fiscal year 2009-10 CCLE budget is funded by CITI funds, IEI funds and carry-over from previous years. Bridge funding is likely to be required in the following fiscal year as a funding model is developed and implemented. The first step in developing a long term funding model was the CCLE business plan delivered to CITI in March 2009. Since then discussion of funding invariably ends up in debates over “fairness” and “individual needs verse the greater good.” Some of the points of agreement that have been heard in discussions thus far included:

11. Long Term Funding Models
• The bulk of CCLE should be paid for out of a larger campus fee. Funding sources that have been discussed include:
  o TIF - captures instructional users as well as research collaborators
  o IEI - primarily College instructional users
  o A new “UC Technology Fee”
• If all or part of CCLE is paid for out of a larger campus fee then all units would indirectly pay, even if they choose to use a different CMS.
• Academic and research users should be willing to pay at least some baseline fee for the system.

Years of work, team building and establishment of trust relationships across campus have gone into making CCLE what it is today. CCLE now directly supports and is integral to education here at UCLA. CCLE is a model for long term cost savings and campus IT efficiency accomplished through the focusing of resources on a common platform coupled with a layered IT services model based upon collaboration. Long term funding sources will need to be identified and secured.
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Plan for scaling the CCLE shared campus system

Estimated on 2/5/2009

Assumptions:
1) As we need to scale we will cluster web servers
2) We will use 10 Gig network cards to boost performance as needed
3) We may invest in DBArtisan to do performance tuning on the database as needed
4) Upper boundaries of courses & students are hit in 2012

Parameters to change:

Cost assumptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Tape Backup system</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Server price</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Arc TB</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 GIG Network Cards</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Unique Logins per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of courses</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>3733</td>
<td>5824</td>
<td>5824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of collab sites supporting</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of sites supporting</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>4240</td>
<td>6483</td>
<td>6681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Enrolled Students</td>
<td>17,676</td>
<td>23,930</td>
<td>42,401</td>
<td>42,401</td>
<td>42,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Unique Logins per day</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>4,786</td>
<td>8,480</td>
<td>8,480</td>
<td>8,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HARDWARE COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROD SYSTEM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webserver(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database &amp; replication db</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Gig Network Cards per srvr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Arc as FileServer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near line - Blue Arc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Tape Backup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHIVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV / TEST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN SYSTEM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HW Estimates:</td>
<td>$40,600</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$48,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SOFTWARE COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOFTWARE</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NEW Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JIRA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linux</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYSQL Enterprise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Artisan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SW Estimates:</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$3,640</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$41,140</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected costs Total:</td>
<td>$41,740</td>
<td>$45,640</td>
<td>$37,140</td>
<td>$57,140</td>
<td>$49,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

CCLE Faculty and Student Surveys

CCLE Student Survey

Participants were asked to respond to 8 multiple-choice and 5 open text questions. See below for the answers to the quantitative questions and a brief summary of the text responses. A list of all comments is available on the CCLE Subgroups page under CIG, working documents: [http://ccle.ucla.edu/mod/resource/view.php?id=79061](http://ccle.ucla.edu/mod/resource/view.php?id=79061). (Please note: this document is very large so it may take a few minutes to load.)

1. Which course management systems (if any) have you used to access course materials? (select all that apply)
   - CCLE (This System): 679 (83.21 %)
   - SSC CCLE: 86 (10.54 %)
   - ClassWeb: 112 (13.73 %)
   - Blackboard: 381 (46.69 %)
   - CourseWeb: 182 (22.20 %)
   - Angel: 3 (0.37 %)
   - WebCT (including Ecampus): 205 (25.12 %)
   - Don’t know: 62 (7.80 %)
   - Other: 93 (11.40 %)

2. How important is it to you that all your courses at UCLA have the same interface and use the same tools?
   - No opinion (0): 96 (11.71 %)
   - Not important (1): 218 (26.59 %)
   - Important (2): 352 (42.93 %)
   - Very important (3): 145 (17.80 %)
   Average: 1.66

3. Which of the following CCLE activities or tools do you find most useful in your courses? (select all that apply)
   - Discussion forums: 240 (30.38 %)
   - Posted documents: 645 (81.65 %)
   - Links to websites: 378 (47.85 %)
   - Assignments: 605 (76.58 %)
   - Gradebook: 416 (52.66 %)
   - Calendar: 193 (24.43 %)
   - Wiki: 40 (5.06 %)

4. How would you describe your overall expertise or skill in using CCLE course tools?
   - Beginner: 50 (36.23 %)
   - Intermediate user: 76 (55.07 %)
   - Expert user: 7 (5.07 %)

5. Please add any comments on CCLE activities/tools
   (198 Total Responses)
• Technical / Interface: 54
• Comments on specific tools: 43
• Faculty are underutilizing and/or misusing their CCLE sites: 31
• PDFs and Documents: 19
• Login issues: 12
• We pay too much for CCLE: 7

6. Overall, what are the most significant advantages of using CCLE to access course materials?
(388 Total Responses)
• 24/7 access: 178
• Course Materials: 142
• Convenience: 87
• Specific Tools: 36
• Design/Organization: 23
• Syllabus: 19
• Good for the Environment: 18
• Improved Communication: 15
• Cheaper than print: 9

7. Overall, what are the most significant drawbacks of using CCLE to access course materials?
(374 Total Comments)
• Professors don’t use / misuse: 75
• Flaws in the Interface: 75
• No drawbacks: 52
• Login Issues: 48
• PDF issues: 38
• Various Tech Issues: 32
• Too slow: 24
• System Instability: 23
• Cost Issues: 20
• Specific Tools: 20
• Inconsistency between sites: 15
• Access restricted: 10

8. Do you think that the CCLE system responds faster now than in past quarters?
- No opinion (0): 465 (56.71 %)
- No, it is slower (1): 23 (2.80 %)
- No difference in speed (2): 188 (22.93 %)
- Yes, it is faster (3): 81 (9.44 %)
Average: 0.71

9. Please add any comments about the CCLE system's speed and reliability.
(204 Total Responses)
- Positive: 89
- Mixed: 53
- Negative: 35
- PDF issues: 15
- Login issues: 15
- Slow at peak usage times: 9
- Don’t Know: 7

10. Do you find CCLE easy to use?
- Very Difficult (0): 7 (0.85 %)
- Difficult (1): 77 (9.39 %)
- Easy (2): 585 (68.00 %)
- Very Easy (3): 103 (12.56 %)
Average: 1.85

11. If you had difficulties with your current course web site, from whom did you receive help or support? (Select all that apply)
- TA: 132 (17.58 %)
- Instructor: 184 (24.90 %)
- Student: 90 (11.98 %)
- Departmental IT support: 19 (2.53 %)
- CCLEhelp@ucla.edu: 26 (3.46 %)
- Other: 10 (1.33 %)
- I had no problem but I didn't seek help: 112 (14.91 %)
- I haven't had any difficulties: 385 (51.28 %)

12. Please rate your overall experience with CCLE:
- Poor (0): 37 (4.51 %)
- Fair (1): 222 (27.07 %)
- Good (2): 422 (51.48 %)
- Excellent (3): 80 (9.76 %)
Average: 1.59

13. Without looking elsewhere for the answer, tell us: What does CCLE stand for? (478 Total Responses)
- Don’t know: 195
- Half right / Good guesses: 136
- Common Collaboration and Learning Environment: 72
- Common Collaborative Learning Environment: 19
- Not even close: 42
- Jokes: 11
- Commentary: 8
CCLE Faculty Survey

Participants were asked to respond to 16 questions, four of which were open-ended. See below for the answers to the quantitative questions and a brief summary of the text responses. A list of all comments is available on the CCLE Subgroups page under CIG, working documents: http://ccle.ucla.edu/mod/resource/view.php?id=79075.

1. Which course management systems have you used to deliver course materials? (select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCLE (This System)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>43.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC CCLE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClassWeb</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CourseWeb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebCT (including Ecampus)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How long have you been using a course management system? (any system, whether at UCLA or elsewhere)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 term or less</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 terms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer than 3 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you find CCLE easy to use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Easy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 1.62

4. How would you describe your overall expertise or skill in using CCLE course tools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate user</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert user</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How many hours of work did it take to reach that level of proficiency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 hrs</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hrs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 hrs</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hrs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hrs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hrs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 hrs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 hrs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 hrs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hrs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 hrs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 9.53*

*Both the lowest number “0” and the highest “9,999,999,999.00”
6. Did you take any training in CCLE?
- Yes, I took an in-person Moodle course from CCLE: 22 (15.94%)
- Yes, I received one-on-one consultation (in-person, email, or phone): 24 (17.39%)
- No, but I wish I had found help: 25 (18.12%)
- No, but I prefer to learn on my own: 55 (39.86%)

7. Do you think that the CCLE system responds faster now than in past quarters?
- No opinion (0): 69 (49.93%)
- No, it is slower (1): 3 (2.17%)
- No difference in speed (2): 26 (18.84%)
- Yes, it is faster (3): 11 (7.97%)
Average: 0.64

8. How frequently do you expect your students to use (login to) your CCLE course site?
- 1/week: 52 (37.68%)
- 2-3/week: 55 (39.86%)
- 4-5/week: 7 (5.07%)
- Daily: 9 (6.52%)

9. Overall, what are the most significant advantages of using CCLE to deliver course material?
(117 Total Responses)
- General usability: 46
- Accessibility (course materials in one place): 25
- Facilitates communication: 7
- Cost savings: 6

10. Overall, what are the most significant drawbacks of using CCLE to deliver course material?
(120 Total Responses)
- General Usability: 21
- Integration with other applications: 3
- Interface/Design: 35
- Application Functionality: 21
- System Functionality and Accessibility: 18
- Support: 4
- Misc: 6
11. What CCLE activities / tools do you already use?
- Making course announcements: 93 (70.45%)
- Uploading and/or linking to course materials: 125 (94.70%)
- Managing Groups: 18 (13.64%)
- Creating quizzes or surveys: 21 (15.91%)
- Choice (single question and up to 6 possible responses): 5 (3.79%)
- Using discussion boards / forums: 63 (47.73%)
- Managing student assignment submissions in CCLE: 27 (20.45%)
- Managing grades in the CCLE gradebook: 25 (18.94%)
- Blogs: 3 (2.27%)
- Course-specific Wiki: 7 (5.30%)
- Wimba Voice Tool: 8 (6.06%)
- Elluminate (within CCLE): 2 (1.52%)
- Back-up/Restoring my course website: 22 (16.67%)
- Creating an archive of my CCLE site: 18 (13.64%)
- Other: 12 (9.09%)

12. Please indicate in which of the following areas you would be interested in receiving training (select all that apply):
- Making course announcements: 9 (7.63%)
- Uploading and/or linking to course materials: 14 (11.85%)
- Managing Groups: 16 (13.56%)
- Creating quizzes or surveys: 37 (31.36%)
- Choice (single question and up to 6 possible responses): 16 (13.56%)
- Using discussion boards / forums: 26 (22.03%)
- Managing student assignment submissions in CCLE: 37 (31.36%)
- Managing grades in the CCLE gradebook: 27 (22.88%)
- Blogs: 20 (16.95%)
- Course-specific Wiki: 33 (27.97%)
- Wimba Voice Tool: 18 (15.26%)
- Elluminate (within CCLE): 20 (16.95%)
- Back-up/Restoring my course website: 26 (23.73%)
- Creating an archive of my CCLE site: 30 (25.42%)
- Not Applicable: I don’t need further training: 27 (22.88%)
- Other: 9 (7.63%)

13. Please indicate the areas in which you would be interested in receiving additional training.
(12 Total Responses)
- Not interested in training: 4
- Would like training in basic features: 2
- Would like training in advanced features: 4
14. Please select how you would like to receive help using CCLE course tools (select all that apply)
- One-on-one help (CCLE Home and/or Local Support): 50 (42.02%)
- Online help documentation: 80 (67.23%)
- An online course delivered through CCLE: 48 (38.66%)
- Printed manual: 27 (22.69%)
- Video: 23 (19.33%)
- Workshops led by CCLE Home and Local Support: 41 (34.45%)
- Peer exchange with other teaching faculty: 21 (17.65%)

15. How would you like to receive information about CCLE updates including features enhancement and system downtime? (select all that apply)
- By email: 85 (64.39%)
- Through Twitter: 5 (3.79%)
- A blog dedicated to CCLE updates: 8 (6.06%)
- By viewing announcements when I log into CCLE: 56 (42.42%)
- Through presentations at department/unit/faculty meetings: 11 (8.33%)
- None of the above; I’ll visit the CCLE help and support website when needed: 24 (18.18%)

16. Please identify one or two features or capabilities you’d like to see incorporated into CCLE in the near future.
(61 Total Responses—duplications removed)
- Integration with other applications: 9
- Interface/Design: 18
- Application Functionality: 26
- System Functionality and Accessibility: 7
- Support: 3
Appendix C
CCLE Subgroups Membership Lists

**Standards and Practice Group (S&PG)**
- Julie Austin - SEAS
- Martin Brennan - Library
- Eric Chang – Extension
- Tito Deveyra – TFT
- Scott Dicks - Nursing
- Curtis Fornadley – CCLE Home
- Bill Jepsen – Arts
- Lisa Kemp Jones - Library
- Max Kopelevich – Physical Sciences
- Peter Kovaric - GSEIS
- Kumar - Management
- Michelle Lew - OID
- Larry Loeher - OID
- Ed Nakashima – Public Health
- Tom Phelan - SSC
- Salman Quazi – Law
- Anju Relan – Medical School
- Vincent Riggs – Public Affairs
- Rose Rocchio - ATS
- Annelie Rugg – CDH
- Mary Tawfall – Dentistry

**Common Interest Group (CIG)**
- Julie Austin, SEAS
- Martin Brennan, Library
- Bob Cargill, CDH
- Annelie Chapman, CDH
- Scott Dicks, Nursing
- Curtis Fornadley, CCLE
- Deborah Kearney, CCLE
- Peter Kovaric, GSEIS
- Kumar, Management
- Michelle Lew, OID
- Vincent Riggs, Public Affairs
- Rose Rocchio, ATS
- Caroline Tam, SSC
- Nick Thompson, CCLE

**System Operations Group (Sys Ops)**
- Eric Bollens, ATS
- Julie Chen, SSC
- Curtis Fornadley, CCLE
- Joseph Lierl, ATS
- Paul Philabaum, Arts
- Rose Rocchio, ATS/OIT
- Ed Sakabu, ATS
- Nick Thompson, CCLE

**Developers Group (DEV)**
- Eric Bollens, ATS
- Harsh Desai, CDH
- Scott Dicks, Nursing
- Curtis Fornadley, CCLE
- Mike Franks, SSC
- Ed Sakabu, ATS
- Nir Shemer, Nursing
- Nick Thompson, CCLE

**Functionality and Support Groups**
- Elaine Blakeman, OID
- Martin Brennan, CCLE/Library
- Bob Cargill, CDH
- Scott Dicks, Nursing
- Travis Garrett, Public Health
- Deborah Kearney, CCLE
- Mauro Leonardo, Astro&Physics
- Ted Liu, CDH
- Nurit Meir, Management
- Paul Philabaum, Arts
- Nir Shemer, Nursing
- Caroline Tam, SSC