

LMS EVALUATION MEETING
Wednesday, November 12, 2003
2:30 PM – 4:00 PM
UPC 301

ATTENDEES:

Alan Shapiro, Mark Billiris, Conferlete Carney, Russell Marsh (for Karen Estes), Anita George, Mary Angeles, Lynda G. Womer, Gary Abernethy, Jim Rutledge, Mark Ingles, David Creamer, Valerie Polansky, Carol Barber.

POINTS OF DISCUSSION:

Two Vendor visits next week, sharing of information from Penn State and discussing steps for the final recommendation.

Alan spoke with Penn State University regarding ANGEL, where they have 55,000 students. They are happy with ANGEL, but they use 3 ½ computer programmers to maintain it. They say it is not necessary to have that many because the product can “stand on its own” performance even though they only have 26 employees. Penn State has two programmers who deal with the code and 1 ½ people work on special projects.

Penn State also has 3,000 groups using collaborative tools in ANGEL to build college courses. They are using the 5.6 version.

They like the fact that when they call they get a real person instead of a recording, but due to the fact that the company is so small they have licensed the source code just in case the company goes out of business.

Alan also spoke to Michigan State University. They still are using BLACKBOARD 4.0 and are looking at BLACKBOARD 6.0. They are not happy with it and are going to transfer to ANGEL.

They have no computer programmers. Their internal testing was good.

They like ANGEL's cost and price protection for 5 years, (license source code) meaning that even when student fees increase their prices will not.

There are only two large institutions that are using ANGEL. Penn State and Michigan State University.

Alan is concerned about the fact that ANGEL has no clock in the quizzes. He wanted to know if there have been any issues with faculty or students with the quizzes because of this.

Conferlete says that there should be different stages of cost consideration:

- First - classroom level cut
- Second - cost to the campus
- Third - district wide administrative costs

Others perception is that online classes are more costly than lecture type classes, but this is not the case.

Dave also agreed that a supplemental system is more costly. We need a copy of the software. We should design some courses in order to determine the final selection. This is a good idea, but most likely will not happen.

Alan stated that ANGEL did not migrate as well as WebCT.

Mark Ingels wanted to know how long it would take after the recommendation was submitted before we actually be using the new or upgraded software.

Conferlete thinks that we should pick our main choice software company and also a 2nd preference to determine which one best meets the needs of the SPC Faculty and family. We should not limit ourselves initially to just one choice, in case it does not meet all of our needs and that we should not decide so quickly.

Conferlete, Alan and **Mark Billiris** will meet to discuss this in more detail.

Anita also stated that there are companies with problems that we are not even aware of. She wants to know if there is a target for profitability.

Valerie would also like to know what the final best offers are before the negotiations begin. ANGEL does not migrate well but she would like input from an architect of the system.

Conferlete stated that we need to refine the rubric over the next 30 days and go with its flow. He stated that the features and ease of use are important but he is somewhat unclear on the architecture and how transactions flow. He does not want to sacrifice Faculty over migration, but that migration should be a second determining factor.

He also stated that PeopleSoft was a huge migration problem. Enrollment cancellation especially malfunctioned. We must consider the picture of the future.

He also suggests that Alan and Mark Ingles physically visit different colleges, using ANGEL, in order to make a more firm decision and Alan concurred. (Most likely this will not occur.)

Mary Angeles was also concerned with any significant issues. Her main issue is the availability of publisher content.

Conferlete said that the transition will be a lot less complicated than changing from REGIS to PeopleSoft.

Faculty will be the ones who really use everything.

Jim Rutledge was concerned about what support needs Penn State and Michigan State had to contact ANGEL about.

He said we should list the top 10 major concerns. He also states that “looking to the future” should be a 3-5 year commitment as there is so much involved and a “big budget” transition.

Jim is also concerned with the size of ANGEL, but it will grow and have more employees in time. He feels a certain loyalty to WebCT, as does **Alan**. It is a large company and quite dependable.

The two vendors WebCT and ANGEL will be here next week for demonstrations and questions and “hands-on” practice with their individual softwares.

ANGEL will be here on Tuesday, November 18th and Wednesday, November 19th.

WebCT will be here on Thursday, November 20th and Friday, November 21st.

Our next LMS meeting will be on Monday, December 1st.

