

## **18 December 2002: CMSAG Summary**

In attendance: Joe Burley, Erin Easterling, Randy Graff, John Holmes, Doug Johnson, Kris Kirmse, Chris Sessums, Ron Thomas, Marvel Townsend, Martin Vala, Mike Wright.

**I. Opening Comments and Discussion:** The final presentation, WebCT, concluded immediately prior to today's meeting. The vendor presentations were a great success. Thanks to all who attended. Those who were unable to participate in one or more of the presentations are expected to view one of the archive formats (Internet stream, video tapes).

**II. Work Groups.** At the last meeting on 4 Dec. we spun off a TCO working group to be headed by Chris Sessums. At today's meeting Joe Burley agreed to head up a work group on Human Resources that will consider both minimum required and optimal staffing levels to support a CMS at UF. Likewise, Mike Wright has agreed to head a work group on technology support to consider what hardware we may need to purchase, what currently owned hardware can be re-tasked, and to recommend to the HR group the personnel and FTE allocation necessary to support different hardware infrastructures.

Each work group will consider TCO, HR, and technology support needs for each of the four CMSs to establish the best foundation for cross- platform comparison.

**III. CMS Evaluation.** With repeatedly asserted warnings that we do not yet have a complete picture of any of the CMSs under consideration, a generalized discussion of our impressions of both the presentations themselves and the CMSs took place. Strengths and weaknesses for each system were identified and various implications of adoption were discussed for each system. There is a clear consensus that each of the four CMSs is considered a viable product for adoption at UF, leaving us the unenviable task of seeking to identify the best of four good options for UF.

After the general discuss of the CMSs, Doug proposed that each Group member answer the following questions and email their responses to Doug, who will aggregate the results and present them for discussion at the next meeting:

- A. Which presentation did you think was most effective? What elements of that presentation interested/impressed you most?
- B. Identify two things about each CMS that would incline you to adopt that CMS  
Identify two things about each CMS that would disincline you to adopt that CMS
- C. Tentatively rank order the candidates from most desired to least desired at this point in the evaluation.  
Identify specific reasons to justify the position of each CMS product in your ranking; e.g. why is #1 preferable to number 2? Why is #3 preferable to #4 but less preferable than #2?

**IV. Additional Vendors.** Doug have been contacted by two additional LMS vendors, Desire2Learn and iPerform Learning Management System requesting consideration of their products. Due to lack of time, this issue was not raised for discussion at the meeting; so the question, "Do we want to take a look at additional products?" will be raised in January.

## **IV. Next Meeting: 8 January 2003**

Despite 8 January being the first week of classes, the consensus of the Group was to meet at the earliest available time. We are still on track for a full report to the Provost by the end of March 2003.