

LMS MEETING

UPC 301

Wednesday, November 5, 2003
2:00PM-4:30PM

Attendees: Alan Shapiro (Project Coordinator), Jim Rutledge, Gary Abernethy, Jim Berry, Mark Billiris, Karen Estes, Li-lee Tunceren, Mark Ingels, Mary Angeles, Carlene M. Peterson, Mike Howard, Anita George, Kevin Patterson, Valerie Polansky, Carol Barber

Object: To discuss the weak and strong points of the four qualifying Course Management Systems, which are **WebCT, Blackboard, Desire to Learn** and **Angel**, for SPC College.

To decide which **two** are the best contenders.

The items to be considered are:

- **Cost**
- **Migration**
- **Maintenance**
- **Faculty Needs**
- **Other Features**

Alan stated that at the Software Olympics, he gave most of his attention and concern to Angel and WebCT. He was not impressed with **Blackboard** as they did not go into much detail regarding their product, they were too busy to send him information and they would not be good for a long term investment. Content Management was not built in. It Needed external dependence on codes. They have a "scary growth rate", somewhat phenomenal, which concerns Alan.

(USF claimed that everything was fine with the upgrades on Blackboard, but that they had to rebuild everything to make it work properly.)

Also, **Desire to Learn** was not willing to "play the game" at the Olympics and they have a serious problem with migration.

There was no "true" integration with PeopleSoft. Content Management was not built in. Needed external dependence on codes. They have a "scary growth rate", somewhat phenomenal, which concerns him.

As far as Chat, Quizzes and Selective Release **WebCT** and **Angel** are the best choices. Alan is very impressed with WebCT.

Mark Ingels, who works with our current PeopleSoft program, stated that he is most interested in which product will be the best for the future. He wants one that will accommodate most of the needs for Faculty and the College and especially meet the need for courses online.

Jim Rutledge was concerned with the weights and categories and thought that the features were the most important element to consider and that cost was the second item of concern. The weighting for the categories were: other factors 20 %, migration 15 %, company 25 %, and features 40 %. (This was a consensus agreement by the entire committee).

Jim Berry is also concerned with the weights and different categories. He agreed that the **Blackboard** presentation at the "Olympics" was not a good one. No salesmanship was mentioned. The cost of ownership was "out of range".

Jim brought up the point that cost should not be a factor at this point in the decision.

Everyone agreed that the software, company, and migration should be the determining factor to choose the two finalists.

Mary Angeles was the only one who prefers **Blackboard**. She thinks the other software programs are cumbersome. Even though Blackboard is not difficult to use, she could find everything. She also stated that it is ready for "Drop-in". She later accepted the fact that she was the only one for it and the group came to the consensus to eliminate **Blackboard**.

Karen Estes thought that **Angel** was responsive and impressive at the "Olympics", but she did not like doing quizzes in it. It did not anticipate her needs.

Everyone else's comments were in agreement with those above.

The following information will show the scores, except for Blackboard, which was eliminated:

	WEBCT / Desire to Learn /Angel		
Quizzes	5	4	4
Chat	5	5	5
Selective Release	3	5	5
Grading Tool	3	5	5
Calendar	5	4	5
File Mngmnt Tool	5	5	5
Email Tool	5	5	5
Content Module	5	3	5
Discussion	5	5	5
Track Student Tools	4	5	5
TOTALS:	47	45	49

Based on the rubric scores and discussion the unanimous decision was made to select WebCT and Angel as the final two choices. This was a consensus agreement by all on the committee.

The agreement was reached that we will have weekly meetings each Wednesday until the Holiday Winter break in December