ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
May 26, 2009
3:30 p.m. – Room BE 248

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

1) **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

2) **COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS**

3) **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

4) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   a) Distance Education Committee meeting – May 12, 2009

5) **ACTION ITEMS**
   a) Course Management System Recommendation

6) **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a) None

7) **REPORTS**
   a) CMS Evaluation Workgroup
   b) Podcasting workgroup
   c) Orientation workgroup
   d) Accessibility workgroup

8) **OTHER**
   a) iTunes Presentation

9) **ADJOURNMENT**

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING
May 26, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT		MEMBERS ABSENT	GUESTS
Rick Balogh	Beverly Beyer	Dr. Forte-Parnell	Greg Krynen
Dr. Nancy Bednar	Dr. Tom O'Neil	Tom Hutchinson	Stephen Burns
John Vento		Mike Wilmes	Ken Sawicki
Dr. Ed Beyer		Luis Echeverria	Scott Tuss
Bonnie Curry			
Connie Moise			

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
   Dr. Ed Beyer, Distance Education Committee Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. One correction to agenda: under 8a – there will be no iTunes Presentation.

2. **COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS**
   - Dr. Forte-Parnell, Committee Co-Chair, was unable to attend the meeting but she forwarded to Dr. Beyer the following: in the fall 2008, distance education courses generated 286 FTES and since the last Distance Education annual report, we have offered 15 new courses online. Also, there is a conference on distance teaching and learning slated for August 4-7, 2009 in Madison, WI. A brochure was handed around. Finally, this is the last meeting as co-chair of the DEC Committee for Dr. Beyer. He expressed his thanks and appreciation to all the members for their time and effort that they put into the committee. Mr. Rick Balogh will be taking over in the fall.

3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
   - None

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   - A motion was made (Dr. O'Neil) and seconded (Dr. Bednar) to approve the May 12, 2009 Distance Education Committee meeting minutes. Corrections received from Ms. Moise were incorporated into the minutes. With no further corrections or discussion, the vote to approve was put before the committee members. We had one abstention to the minutes but all other members approved. Motion passed.

5. **ACTION ITEMS**
   - Course Management System Recommendation (Moise) – Dr. Beyer made note that the committee had gone through discussions, evaluations, 6 videos online, plus would like to thank Connie for the spreadsheets that were put online and were attached to the minutes. Dr. Beyer did not receive one comment back from any committee member. He reiterated

that even though it may have been a little painful to listen to all six presentations, it gave the opportunity to the whole campus to review and give feedback. At the last meeting, it was decided to eliminate down to three choices. Those eliminated were RSmart, ETudes and ECollege. Rick questioned why we eliminated Etudes? Dr. Beyer explained these reasons: the workload on the local system administrator and the fact that faculty would not be able to copy their own courses from semester to semester. This would have to be done by Etudes.

Connie was tasked at the last meeting with procuring quotes on the three remaining systems. She passed out copies of this information to all members. Connie explained that she was trying to get quotes on a comparison of apples to apples basis. It was noted that we received a 25 page quote from Desire2Learn which was very professionally done. Angel responded with a 1 ½ page quote and Blackboard with a very brief spreadsheet. Connie followed up with each of these three vendors to finalize the information that she has put on the spreadsheet that was passed out, including the initial cost (starting July 1) for each and also the estimated annual cost. She mentioned that in the left-hand column was the title for each component and then the responses to those per each vendor across the sheet.

Dr. Bednar questioned why was FTES for Blackboard listed at 4-8K where Desire2Learn was listed at 11K+? Connie responded that in the first year there are some cases of implementation or startup fees and in some cases, there are discounts for the first year such as the signing fee or signing discount so that is why there is a difference between what we would pay to sign on with a vendor or to continue with Blackboard at the ongoing cost. She then addressed the issue of training (for faculty) with each vendor. She tried to maintain similarity between all three so that we would have comparable costs. Dr. Bednar questioned if Blackboard based the site license on 11K FTES such as the others are, what would the cost be? Connie replied that the FTES numbers quoted are close to what we are currently without going out of our price band and that we are a current customer. Dr. Bednar asked for clarification in that if we do not utilize shells beyond the 4-8K allotment, then the price would not be increased to the next price band. Ms. Moise concurred with that. She also mentioned that Angel bases their licensing structure on actual users but this would create a management challenge for us. We would have to have a process or person in place who would track the users, but this decreases the cost.

Ms. Moise reminded everyone that the costs shown on the chart are not set in concrete and that there is much room for negotiation. The question was posed that with the absorption of Angel by Blackboard, would that eliminate Angel. The answer is that at this time Angel would still be operating on a separate basis from Blackboard. Dr. Beyer questioned why do we have a cost for integration when we are already a customer? Connie relayed that this cost is always in there no matter what and she is not happy about it. It is a fee to allow us to have that integration in place. Connie feels that this fee would be something to bring up in negotiation to try and eliminate. She went on further to relay that they feel the fee is justified in that we are not a "cookie cutter" implementation of hosted Blackboard service because we have this integration piece running.

Dr. Beyer brought up the cost of $8,000/day for training under Blackboard. Ms. Moise clarified that it is not per day but went on to say the $8,000 buys a license to access their online training series, plus they also offer face-to-face training series. This license allows all faculty to access the material countless number of times. If we want to continue that after the first year, we would pay $2,500 to maintain access to those materials. Ms. Moise feels that it is a pretty good offer compared to the other two. If we want to add their Blackboard face-to-face training plus their online training, it is $11,700 per year. Deciding what type of training we would want would decide the cost of such. They could also provide a $390 per faculty for training sessions which would, in essence, be like a professional development course. This would be 15-20 hours of course work over 14 days. Dr. Beyer asked if Ms. Moise felt there were any "red flags". The only thing that caught her eye was the Desire to Learn implementation fee ($22,500), but there are several levels of implementation as there is with the others.

Dr. Beyer then questioned about storage and costs. Ms. Moise stated that there was no response from Angel nor Desire to Learn but she could ask them. Ms. Moise stated that she had received some of this material just today and had not been able to forward it to the members, but if anyone is interested, she would be glad to do so.

Dr. Beyer then questioned the committee members on their thoughts about the three candidates. Ken Sawicki stated that he tested all three for accessibility, including Blackboard Version 9. He felt that the clear winner was Blackboard. He encountered difficulty in login with both Angel and Desire to Learn. He was using an astronomy course of Rick's who had imbedded a video but Ken could not view it. It was a function of having the correct version of Java on the computer.

Dr. Bednar questioned about if accessibility would qualify for accreditation. Dr. Beyer indicated that it is a determining factor. Scott Tuss, the portal administrator on campus, mentioned that they looked at the portal for Blackboard for single sign-on purposes. But being that Blackboard is on a shared server, we cannot do single sign-on. He questioned that if we went with Blackboard again, that we have a dedicated server so that we can do single sign-on and more importantly, the integration of when a student adds a class and it would automatically be added to Blackboard. Ms. Moise stated that all three quotes are for shared servers and she did not ask for the "real time integration" fee. Dr. Beyer stated that it would be nice to have a dedicated server strictly for AVC but with price and budget issues, it would more than likely remain on a shared server. Ms. Moise stated that these quotes are the beginning figures for future negotiation and things could change. Rick Balogh used his course in all three choices and found it to be acceptable across the board. All aspects were present and functioned properly.

Dr. Beyer then went around the room asking the members what was their third choice: Rick – Desire to Learn, Mark – Desire to Learn, Tom – Desire to Learn, Connie – same, John, Desire, Nancy – Desire, Bonnie – Desire, Beverly – Desire. That now leaves us with two choices – Angel and Blackboard but keep in mind that Blackboard has purchased Angel. Dr. Beyer made mention that the last time a choice was made it was between Blackboard and WEB CT, but it was before an announcement was made that Blackboard was purchasing them. But Dr. Beyer feels that with the new version 9 of Blackboard that you see a tremendous increase in web ct, and within several years, he

feels that with the issue of functionality, there will be a tremendous increase between the two. Hopefully, we will see the issue of integration of customer service sooner.

He stated that if we chose to move to Angel at this time, we would have a whole new realm of learning that we would have to go through, and then three years down the road, we would come back around to Blackboard. If we stay with Blackboard, we will go to the new look and then eventually, veer inward to Angel. Dr. O'Neil made the statement that he would like to see a match of the 11,189 FTES from Blackboard and Blackboard needs to justify the $8,000 in training charges. The question came up about the fact that there is no integration costs under Angel. Connie had forwarded to each company their column from her spreadsheet to make sure it was represented correctly. She received responses from Blackboard and Desire to Learn. Dr. Beyer then proceeded to remove fees from Blackboard to make it more equal to Angel, but you would still have the costs of moving over, including frustration by faculty and students. Connie spoke up to say that the integration costs of Angel are incorporated into their main fee, but Dr. Beyer felt that Angel would have to come in at a much lower charge to get his vote. Connie wanted to remind the committee members that Angel had been quoted as an "Unlimited Site" License (based on FTES) to equal itself to Blackboard, but they also have a User Account License (5,000, 7,500 and 10,000 users). The 10,000 user account would require us to maintain who could use it and who could not, so there would be issues for us in that regard. But it does give us lower licensing fee ($40,300) and hosting fee ($59,700). It definitely is lower in cost to us but adds cost to the back end for administration work. The question was posed on how many online faculty are using Blackboard exclusively and how many faculty are using it in their face-to-face classes. No one had an answer to this. There is now a trend that once a faculty is clued into the Blackboard shell that would relate to their class, they are much more receptive to using it for posting items.

Dr. Bednar brought up the question of FTES computations and training expenses. There had been differing opinions about FTES so once there was consensus on this, the number of course shells and user accounts was not a factor. Ms. Moise stated that in her experience with negotiating any type of software package, the companies have started to use FTES just as a point in pricing (word deleted) so the quote will be an unlimited user license. It has nothing to do with what our actuals are, but lets them say we are "about that big" so this is what you need. Dr. Bednar also had concerns about the costs associated with Angel training ($5,000 to train 12 people). Greg brought up the fact that there will be training involved even if we choose to stay with Blackboard. Since we would be incorporating Version 9, the new system uses drag and drop instead of being menu based. So he will be training people, both old and new, since it is a completely new system so the hours will remain the same. Also, he is having more and more faculty come in to get trained on making their classes hybrid. This will make a difference in that the faculty does not have to provide the paper volume (which we are trying to cut down on) to the student. The information they need for the class can be found on Blackboard.

One more comment from Connie on user support for Angel and Blackboard for the students. There is no difference since both use Presidium, but Angel has been known to have better customer service. Dr. Beyer relayed that since Blackboard purchased Angel, they took the head of their customer service and installed him within Blackboard.

Dr. Beyer now went around the room asking each member their choice and rationale – Beverly – Blackboard because of accessibility and, hopefully, easier use; Nancy – Blackboard because of Ken's remarks on accessibility and Rick's remarks on the ease of moving over your course to the new version; Bonnie – Blackboard due to Ken's remarks on accessibility and Rick's on transferability; John – Blackboard – price (but will be negotiated further); Connie – Blackboard - based on the amount of workload within ITS and that we already have Blackboard in place; Tom – Blackboard – accessibility and price and the fact he has one faculty member with 15,000 pages on the system now; Mark – Blackboard – his choice due to accessibility, transferability, price, new features and the fact that we already have it installed and ITS is already familiar with it; Rick – Blackboard – since next year he does not want to have any issues with Course Management System since he will be the next chair. Dr. Beyer also likes staying with the new Blackboard due to its accessibility, the conversion factor and the comfort. He was thrilled with some of the new changes after viewing the presentation from Blackboard.

Dr. Beyer determined that the overwhelming features from the members was accessibility, followed by conversion, then price, ITS workload, no issues and then comfort. It is clear that the committee needs to make a motion to make a recommendation that will be taken to the Senate. Dr. Bednar made a motion that the committee recommend to the Senate that they adopt Blackboard Version 9.0 as our new Course Management System when our current term with Blackboard expires. A second came from Beverly. Any discussion from the members? Connie did mention that Blackboard would not shut us down even after the July 1 expiration date. The question came up if we would go to Version 8 first but the decision would be made to go directly with Version 9. Connie will continue to work with Blackboard to get the best deal and she would like to work with others on training issues and what help they need. There are many options so we need to decide which ones are the best to purchase.

If anyone should receive e-mails or contact from any of the others vendors, please forward them to Rick. Ken also questioned if Blackboard would provide accessibility training? Connie would check on that. Scott Tuss appeared today in order to present himself and be available to answer any questions.

After all discussion, the motion was called for a vote. All members voted aye with no abstains and the motion was passed.

6. **DISCUSSION**
   - None

7. **REPORTS** –
   a. CMS Evaluation Workgroup - none
   b. Podcasting Workgroup - none
   c. Orientation Workgroup - none
   d. Accessibility Workgroup – none

8. **OTHER**
   - Starting July 1, the new membership takes place and Rick Balogh will be the new co-chair. Ken Sawicki will be a new member. Go to the DEC website and check out the

new membership. Rick mentioned that there will be a new meeting time and he will send out an e-mail asking for suggestions.

9. ADJOURNMENT
A motion was made (Nancy) and seconded (Mark) to adjourn the Distance Education Committee meeting at 4:30 p.m. Motion carried.

pag