

LMS MEETING  
Monday, December 8, 2003  
UP 301  
2:00 PM-4:00 PM

**ATTENDEES:** Alan Shapiro, Karen Estes, Mary Angeles, Valerie Polansky, Anita George, Mike Howard, Jim Rutledge, Li-Lee Tunceren, Kevin Patterson and Carol Barber

**GOAL:** To discuss the advantages and disadvantages of Angel and WebCt in order to make a final decision for recommendation.

**Alan** states that due to his relationship with WebCT he felt a certain loyalty to them. Change is difficult no matter who we decide to go with. There will be risks with either one.

He is going to submit the name of Angel because he feels they will be the best in the “long run”.

First they need to make some changes before we sign a contract. They need to:

- Make a “drop and drag” ability-this is an absolute “deal breaker”
- Make a third party software, such as E-pak
- Make it work well so as not to “lose” the online instructors
- Prove and improve the migration tool
- Make the quizzes automatic instead of manual (like they are now)
- Make it so the students can do “self-registration”
- Do a “content share”
- Reduce the daily “down” time

**Alan** also said that if we stay with WebCT we will need another programmer. That will be a lot more costly, per each software, over a three year period.

He also says that Conferlete Carney is still not convinced with the architecture of Angel.

He said the message board on Angel can be shared among multiple classes. It only needs to be set up one time and it can transfer one message to all classes being taught. No need to write the same message several times.

**Alan** stated that Miami-Dade is extremely interested in Angel and will be making their decision soon.

Gulf Coast University is also in the final stages with Angel.

**Mary** suggests that the migration tool needs to be “proven” by the architect and considers Angel to be a “risk”. She likes Vista, but Angel is easier to use and thinks it would be more of a benefit to the users due to its responsiveness.

Availability to Angel, as needed is very important. They should be specific when there is “down time” and we should request this requirement in writing.

**Li-Lee** suggested using Angel on a trial basis, testing it on a designated class, next session.

She likes the fact that they listen to the users, when they have a need or an issue.

She also likes the fact that the “hierarchy” of the system can view all of the items being used.

**Mike** says that this is a new program for Corporate Training.

He’d like to know what WebCT can do for us.

He says that when he asks them a question on a specific item they only answer from an academic point of view instead of a business point of view.

He feels the promises with them are limited. He thinks that a member of the committee should investigate the benefits of each.

**Jim** agrees that Angel being “down” every Monday and Thursday in the AM for a designated period of time is definitely a “drawback”.

He understands that there are risks involved with any new software program, but Angel does have the capability for making changes.

He likes the fact that the action editor has a grading capability.

**Mark** prefers Angel and likes its ability to query the database. This allows him to create reports quickly.

**Valerie** says that we need to admit to the Faculty that there will be a “learning curve” as some of them are apprehensive.

She agrees that Angel is easier to use and much more effective than WebCT unless we can get WebCT to improve on some of their problems.

She thinks we should put it in writing all of the benefits to the college by selecting Angel.

**Kevin** also would like the committee to make a list of all of the problems and negative factors associated with both software companies.

He thinks that making a recommendation is “moving ahead” for the college and thus “taking the lead” in education.

He also states that we need to list the things that need attention in Angel and WebCT.

**Karen** suggested that the committee have an email group just for this purpose.

So Alan made the email group list at the end of the meeting.

Everyone will “chat” online regarding the negative and positive factors for WebCT and Angel for the next few weeks until the final selection is made.

Dr. Olliver just wants the Board of Trustees to be happy with the decision of the committee. He wants it to be easier for faculty and students to learn on the new system.

The Committee, as a whole, agreed with the following recommendation:

Both WebCT Vista and Angel are viable alternatives. However, the committee recommends Angel as the choice the college should pursue. This is partially based on Angel’s ease of use and rich feature set.

