

Web Content Management System (CMS) Task-Force
Meeting Notes November 17, 2015
District Office – Conf. Room 2

Members present: Jeannine Methe, Amanda Pisani, Katherine Tollefsen, Timothy Druley, Kali Davis-Rippel, Guisselle Nunez; and via CCCConfer: Greg Johns, Don Miller, Mike Seaton, Norman Buchwald and Wing Kam

Agenda item #3 CMS Vendor Demos:

First topic was to review the list of vendors who did demos for LPC. Tim D. has looked at four out of the five demos and also contacted the vendors directly: OmniUpdate, Hannon Hill/Cascade Server (used by CSUEB), LiveWhale and Engeniux. Wing K. has also looked at all the demos. The spreadsheet that Scott Vigallon did has a lot of information for us to start with. Wing K. followed up with the vendors to do a “deep dive” for OmniUpdate, Live Whale and Hannon Hill/Cascade Server. Unable to contact CampuSuite. Tim D. clarified that Concrete 5 is open source.

Jeannine M. asked how should we evaluate the different CMS programs? We need to come up with a list of “must have” features vs. highly desirable features, and also need to take into consideration pricing/cost. We need to make a list of requirements and a scoring scale. Once we come up with this list then ask the vendors to do another live demo for us and be ready to ask our specific questions about each product on the short list.

Agenda item #6 Proposed Timeline for Product Selection & Implementation:

Don M. reported that the LPC President wants it “ASAP” (in Spring 2016). Guisselle N. thought maybe it would be easier to roll it out in different phases. Don M. asked if it would be possible to pick our top three by the end of the year, to take to the executive level by mid February. Norman B. brought up that due to the cost, it would have to go to Board for approval. Mike S. added that it would be most practical to implement the CMS over the summer.

Norman B. and Tim D. agreed that if we start with a sandbox version, then it would be easier and quicker to switch over to the “live” version. Wing K. agreed that summer would be the ideal time to work with the vendor to also work on the site(s) redesign. Mike S. reminded everyone that we would also need time for training of not just the webmasters, but also users who will be updating content. Don M. agreed that going live in summer would be OK, but that we need to make sure that faculty have input (for redesign) before summer, then start building the site and go-live in the Fall, with training for faculty throughout the Fall semester before their site would go live. Mike S. stated that there are about 100 -150 faculty who have their own sites at Chabot. Wing

K. has already started a web advisory group (WAG) at Chabot to get ideas for new site design. Wing K. also reminded us that there are two parts of the site – the administrative side and the instructional side. Maybe we implement the administrative type pages first, and do a more gradual roll-out of the instructional pages.

Jeannine M. thought that if we could put up a test site and have people (including students) give feedback that would also help in the redesign process.

Tim D. has been targeting the heavily hit parts of the LPC website first (faculty pages would probably be last) and feels (and Wing K. concurs) that it doesn't need to be an all or nothing approach, that they can roll out parts of the website as they get done. Don M. shared that at a previous educational institution he was at, the migration to a new website was gradual, done in rounds. As an example, his division at LPC has twenty programs, so maybe only five of them would be rolled-out in the first round.

Jeannine M. asked Guisselle N. what she thought about this approach, and Guisselle N. thought doing it in phases sounded like a good idea. Need to keep a project management sheet to keep track, and also to keep track of all the groups on a calendar to make sure no one is left out. This way it also matches the redesign training with the roll-out schedule.

Agenda Item #5 Target for Decision on Vendor Short List:

Jeannine M. stated that the first thing we need to do is get a vendor selected pretty quickly. If we say by the end of February, that gives us only 5 – 6 meetings. We could try to have a final recommendation the first Tuesday in March – on March 1.

Jeannine M. concluded that we should try to have a vendor short list (2 – 3) by the end of January.

Agenda Item #4 Other Vendors to add to List?

Wing K. asked if WordPress could be added to the list, and Tim D. asked if Drupal could be added as well.

Wing K. asked how and when would we get user feedback on the CMS choices?

Don M. thought February would be a good time during the semester to get user feedback.

Greg J. added that it would be important to include users who are already updating web content, like the administrative assistants.

Tim D. thought maybe it would be best to only include those users when evaluating the short list.

Greg J. said to include users who manage campus event calendars (like presidents offices) and have a deadline for feedback.

There was discussion about timelines for feedback and what exactly users will be asked to give feedback on. The group agreed that this user feedback period is critical but it might extend the timing for our final recommendation beyond March 1. Norman B. said that basically user feedback will help us to make the final decision.

Agenda item #2 Identify List of Requirements for Product Evaluation with Scoring Sheet:

Jeannine M. asked the webmasters to come up with a list of the requirements for the CMS with a scoring system and to have this done by the Dec. 1 meeting.

Agenda item #9 Customer References on Product Usage:

Guisselle N. asked if there could be a line item for references or clients who are actually using the product. Someone recently posted the question on a statewide listserv asking which product the community colleges are using and OmniUpdate was the number one answer. Wing K. added that one in four community colleges uses it.

Agenda item #7 Vendor Models offered – Local vs. Cloud option:

Jeannine M. reminded us that we also need to look at the locally hosted vs. cloud option. Cloud is good for getting support – our license with Blackboard is a good example of this. Tim D. also prefers cloud hosted because you can get instant back-ups.

Kali D. brought up that they have hosted library guides at LPC and when something goes down, it's back up within ten minutes.

Mike S. added that you lose control over some things, as long as someone in the district/campus has administrative rights if something goes down, but he's OK either way. Would also be nice if users could authenticate using Active Directory.

Jeannine M. added that The Zone portal (which is an Ellucian Banner product, and separate from the college websites, like CLASS-Web) will be getting upgraded to version five. There will be a separate group of users being brought in to evaluate how to update the content and streamline the portal. The Zone can be used for intranet type content. We just need to be aware not to duplicate information. Users that were here during the first Zone implementation as well as other user groups will be involved in this new version implementation.

Guisselle N. asked about the intranet. She feels there is a lot of information on the public websites that doesn't need to be there, that would be better on an intranet. Jeannine M. commented that the portal would be a good place to put this type of information/content.

Agenda item #8 Web CMS Funding Alternatives:

Jeannine M. reported that the Innovation Funds have not been announced yet, but she knows that Chabot will be getting \$80K toward a CMS. Wing K. noted that this only covers the CMS, not any website redesign. Jeannine M. noted that LPC had a line item for web design for \$40K, but that might go toward a CMS instead. Question also came up about ongoing maintenance costs – hopefully this expense can be incorporated into the first three years as part of the purchase agreement.

Wing K. shared that as an example, OmniUpdate has a one-time \$20K set-up fee. What if we don't have enough money to cover the expense?

Jeannine M. hopes that the Innovation Funds will cover the initial cost and may have to make a proposal to the CLPCCD executive team for on-going costs/expenses.

Guisselle N. asked if maybe we could include that in our criteria, if there is any support for design.

Wing K. stated that web redesign is a whole different issue, and we should ask that question of the vendors.

Guisselle N. added that in her role she would like to be involved on the Web Advisory Groups at all sites.

Wing K. stated that right now the focus (for Chabot) is on the homepage or "portal" pages of shared information with only some discussion on layout and design.

Jeannine M. concluded that we may need to find a different vendor to help with the website redesigns.