Analyse: Wat zijn de criteria die de keuze van een nieuwe LMS software bepalen ?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Versie | Datum | Auteur | Reden van wijziging |
| 0 1 | 10/04/2013 | Bram Lauwers | Opstart Document |
| 1 0 |  |  | Validatie Document |
|  |  |  |  |

# Opzet van dit document:

Via dit document wensen we een aantal criteria op te stellen die ons zullen helpen om een objectieve en correcte vergelijking te kunnen maken tussen de verschillende LMS software.

Deze criteria werden overgenomen van [McGill University’s work on LMS selection](http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/EDU05197.pdf) . In samenspraak met Jean-Marc en Dicky werden de verschillende criteria overlopen en aangepast. Een aantal criteria werden gewist en anderen werden toegevoegd.

In het analyserooster werden zeven Prime Keys gedefinieerd. Indien de LMS software niet voldoet aan een van deze belangrijke criteria zullen we deze in se uitsluiten tijdens de keuze.

Elke LMS Software zal worden vergeleken aan de hand van dit rooster. Op deze manier ontvangt elke LMS software punten en kunnen we overgaan tot een objectieve beargumenteerde keuze.

**Criteria for the evaluation of e-learning systems**

This set of criteria may be used as a starting point for your deliberations and should be modified to meet your specific needs and values. You are welcome to adapt this grid according to the Creative Commons license referenced below. [[1]](#footnote-1)

First, define the “deal breakers” – those features which, if missing or inadequate, render a product useless to you. Then apply the “use case” approach for each product you are considering: “What will be the quality of my experience?”

**Score each as “Acceptable” “Unacceptable” or “Recommended”**

| **Evaluation Rubric** | **Fair** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pedagogical design** | Provides basic access to organized materials but few opportunities for interaction, constructivist or engaging methods. | Provides basic access to content as well as tools for engaging students, interactive learning. | Provides access to content that integrates well with interactive tools, and new pedagogical tools are being routinely added to the system. |  |
| **PRIME Key**  **Design and layout** | Functional interface with decent layout but somewhat complex and counterintuitive. Aesthetics are bland or distracting. | Good functional interface that can be navigated with minimal training. Good look and feel. | Simple, intuitive interface with minimal clicks to access materials, little or no training needed to get started, and the look and feel is inviting. |  |
| **Content organization** | LMS provides a basic repository for course content. | LMS provides a repository for content and basic tools for content organization. | LMS provides a framework for diverse storage and use strategies, from public, private and shared workspaces, to subscription-based content (e.g., podcasts and feeds) to archival content. |  |
| **Archives – Backup** | Some archival tools but much of the process is manual. Archived courses are not available to be viewed by the instructor. | Good archival tools that support backup of completed courses with student submissions and discussions intact. The LMS administrator must set up instructor access to the completed course. | Powerful archive tools that support automatic backup of completed courses with student submissions and discussions intact. Instructors have full access and control of completed courses. |  |
| **Communication** | LMS provides secure access to the email addresses that comprise the class roster, but individuals may not be selectable for private email. | Both asynchronous (email) and synchronous communication tools are present. | LMS provides a high level of flexibility for the use of email (asynchronous by roster, individual or group) as well as instant messaging, chat and threaded discussions. |  |
| **PRIME Key**  **File exchange Cloud storage** | LMS provides secure drop-box functionality so that students can exchange materials with instructors. | LMS provides drop-box and ability for students and faculty to upload resources to a central course repository. | LMS provides secure drop-boxes and shared folders for file exchange among students as well as instructors and allows for bulk downloads of attached files. |  |
| **PRIME Key**  **Sections and groups** | LMS allows instructors to define sub-groups of students within the class roster for purposes of communication and collaborative work. | LMS allows sub-groups but allows the instructor the choice of interacting with only the sub-group or the entire course in all available tools. | LMS provides the hierarchy to support sections within a single course so that course content is shared among sections. Instructors can define sub-groups of students which then link to separate content repositories and tools. |  |
| **E-portfolio** | Basic tools allow students and instructors to gather student work products for assessment and presentation. | Tools allow students and instructors to create ad-hoc or structured presentations of resources. | A full-featured e-portfolio tool is integrated into the LMS and makes possible the gathering, review and presentation of work products to support any portfolio strategy (resume, learning, tenure, etc). Reporting tools allow for individual, departmental or institutional assessments. |  |
| **Discussion tools** | Adequate speed and functionality with the ability to attach files | Quick and functional with user profiles or pictures, file attachments and html interface. | Extremely fast and highly functional with user profiles and pictures, files attachments and easy html interface. |  |
| **Course evaluations** | Basic survey tools for capturing student reflections on course, instructor | Anonymous evaluations that can be gathered by the faculty including question pools and templates. | Hierarchical and flexible system for anonymous evaluations at course, department and institutional level for either summative or formative purposes. Includes item pools, templating, announcements, reminders, and tools to easily target different audiences. |  |
| **Gradebook and student tracking** | Moderately functional gradebook that is relatively easy to use. Minimal tools for student tracking. | Functional gradebook that is easy to use. Grades can be exported to a spreadsheet. Student tracking tools give the instructor some information about student progress. | Highly functional gradebook that is easy to use. Grades can be exported to a spreadsheet of student information system. Student tracking tools give the instructor information about what pages the student has viewed and what tasks have been completed. The student can be automatically emailed when their participation is substandard. |  |
| **Collaboration** | Allows shared access to files among users and some tools for asynchronous collaboration. | Provides access to shared files and some tools for asynchronous and synchronous collaboration and communication. Limited group functionality. | Provides a campus-wide framework that supports collaborative work such as wiki with version tracking, threaded discussion, instant messaging and chat, whiteboard, web conferencing (audio and video). Enables subgroups to be defined within courses for collaboration. Provides non-course sites to support special project work among small groups. |  |
| **Integration with Student Information System**  **(Interface ITMA)** | Integration is possible but will require a high level of product customization. | Tools for integration are available but some tasks will need to be completed manually or in a batch process. | Seamless integration with automatic updating of student and faculty lists and all rosters. Students can be automatically emailed course access information. Student and faculty profiles with pictures and syllabi can be shared between the LMS and the SIS. |  |
| **Integration with library resources** | Limited to no integration with locally licensed library content. | Ability to create resources that can be resolved to library-controlled databases. | Tools are present that allow faculty to find and reference both public and licensed library materials, including full texts. Students are able to access these materials once logged into the system from any location. |  |
| **Integration with campus portal (ITMA Participant Portal)** | LMS is accessible through the campus portal but only by linking that requires a separate authentication by the user. | LMS is linked with the portal via single sign-on, but the only level of integration possible is the iFrame. | LMS and portal share single sign-on and select tools can be integrated with the portal via industry-standard integrations (JSR-168 or WSRP). |  |
| **Use of open standards (open-source)** | Standards are seen as a goal, but the implementation of standards is missing or incomplete. | Open standards (IMS CP, QTI, etc) are used in the LMS but are incomplete or are built in combination with proprietary methods that create “product lock-in” and inflexibility. | Open standards are incorporated wherever appropriate in the LMS and are leveraged to provide as many options as possible. No proprietary components are present that require separate licensing or lock in data. |  |
| **Server requirements** | LMS only operates on one operating system and requires special configurations of hardware or supporting software. | LMS is available on multiple platforms but does not offer compatibility with an implementer’s choice of application server or database. | Server software operates on a wide variety of operating systems (Windows, Linux/Unix, Mac) using commodity hardware and industry-standard web servers. |  |
| **Scalability** | LMS has no problem meeting demands of a small institution on a single server. | LMS supports “clustering” and the ability for multiple servers to act in unison, but there are few installations supporting over twenty thousand users. | LMS clusters well and has been known to support installations well over one hundred thousand users. |  |
| **Browser setup and support** | Supports the most popular browsers with end user set up and installation of necessary components. May have a “preferred” browser for proper operation. | Supports most browsers with minimal effort from the user. | Supports all browsers and platforms with no special setup requirements for the user. Is able to render the LMS experience in most browsers with consistency. |  |
| **Tin Can Compatibility** | LMS is not compatible with the new standard Tin can | LMS could be compatible with the new standard Tin can, with custom devellopments | LMS is ready to use the new standard Tin can |  |
| **Custom devellopments** | Custom developments need to be written all over again in the new code of the LMS a big investment is required to adapt the LMS | Custom developments need to be rewritten in the new code of the LMS minimal investment is required to adapt the LMS | Custom developments can be copy pasted in the new code of the LMS minimal investment is required to adapt the LMS |  |
| **PRIME Key**  **Roles** | LMS has different roles but not the possibility to log on the LMS, with an other user | LMS has different roles and the possibility to log on the LMS, with an other user | LMS has the possibility to create your own roles, the possibility to log on the LMS, with an other user |  |
| **PRIME Key**  **Mobile Access** | LMS is not ready for Mobile Access. Big investments needs to done to adapt the graphic interface | LMS is ready for Mobile Access. Minimal investments needs to done to adapt the graphic interface | LMS is ready for Mobile Access. |  |
| **PRIME Key**  **Datadigger compatibel** | LMS database is not accessible for SQL querries. Existing reports provide sufficient information. | LMS database is not accessible for SQL querries. Custom developed reporting needs to be developed. | LMS database is accessible for SQL querries. |  |
| **PRIME Key**  **Cost /Free (open source)** | LMS is not open-source | LMS is open-source with an active community. | LMS is open-source with an active community. Developments can be exchanged in the community. |  |
| **IT security** | IT service thinks the LMS isn’t secured | IT service says the LMS is secured sufficient | IT service is convinced that the LMS is secured |  |

This grid was adapted from several sources on e-learning systems evaluations including [McGill University’s work on LMS selection](http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/EDU05197.pdf)
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