



# LMS Vendor Evaluation Report

*PRESENTED BY: ISHAN KANWAL, GABRIEL ROY, KRISH PATEL & DYLAN PATEL*

# Introduction

- ▶ This project evaluates whether Wentworth should renew its Brightspace contract or transition to a new Learning Management System (LMS).
- ▶ The key goals of this evaluation includes:
  - Analyzing the needs of stakeholders, including faculty, students, and administrators.
  - Reviewing vendor offerings to determine alignment with institutional goals.
  - Ensuring the LMS meets WIT's operational and academic requirements effectively.



# Case Analysis: Blackboard to Brightspace Transition

## ▶ **Inconsistent Integration**

- ▶ Blackboard struggled with third-party integrations (e.g., Turnitin, Banner).
- ▶ Resulted in disruptions to course delivery and additional costs.

## ▶ **Inaccurate Gradebook**

- ▶ Professors faced issues with inaccurate grading reports.
- ▶ Created confusion for both students and faculty.

## ▶ **Value for Cost**

- ▶ High cost of Blackboard compared to the functionality provided.
- ▶ Significant dissatisfaction with ROI (Return on Investment).

# Case Analysis: Blackboard to Brightspace Transition

- ▶ **Implementation Complexity**

- ▶ The transition required course rebuilding due to poor migration tools.
- ▶ Time-intensive process led to faculty adaptation challenges.

- ▶ **Faculty and Student Frustration**

- ▶ Adoption of the system was slow due to usability concerns.
- ▶ Additional training was required, increasing transition costs.





# Requirements Gathering: Insights



## ▶ **Transition Cost Concerns**

- ▶ High financial and time costs for switching to a new LMS.
- ▶ Challenges in staff training and implementation logistics.

## ▶ **Canvas vs. Brightspace**

- ▶ Canvas is favored for user-friendliness but involves higher transition costs.
- ▶ Brightspace's familiarity reduces disruption and minimizes learning curves.

## ▶ **Stakeholder Feedback**

- ▶ Faculty and students highlighted real-time grading and usability improvements.
- ▶ Administrative staff emphasized seamless integration with current systems.

## ▶ **Desired LMS Features**

- ▶ Cost-effective enhancements over full-scale LMS migration.
- ▶ Simplified workflows, enhanced integrations, and user-friendly interface.



# Vendor Analysis: Vendor Selection

- ▶ 8 LMS platforms researched for suitability. Four platforms were selected for further evaluation:
- ▶ Brightspace, Canvas, Moodle, and Blackboard Ultra.
- ▶ Research sources: Vendor websites, industry reports, stakeholder feedback.

# Vendor Analysis: LMS Priorities

PRIORITIES & CONDITIONS	WEIGHT (%)	PRIORITY LEVEL
Enhancing User Experience	20%	High
Gradebook	7 %	High
Other teaching and learning support	8 %	High
Seamless Integration (Banner, etc.)	20%	Highest
Scalability and Flexibility	10%	Medium
Data Security and Compliance	15%	High
Robust Reporting and Analytics	10%	Medium
Training and Support	5%	Low
Cost of Transition	5%	Low



# Vendor Analysis: Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Weight (%)	Canvas	Brightspace	Blackboard Ultra	Moodle
Enhancing User Experience	20%	18%	16%	16%	14%
Gradebook	7%	5.6%	4.9%	6.3%	4.2%
Teaching and Learning Support	8%	7.2%	7.2%	7.2%	6.4%
Seamless Integration	20%	18%	20%	18%	14%
Scalability and Flexibility	10%	9%	8%	8%	9%
Data Security and Compliance	15%	12%	13.5%	12%	10.5%
Robust Reporting and Analytics	10%	8%	8%	8%	7%
Training and Support	5%	4%	3.5%	3.5%	3%
Cost of Transition	5%	3.5%	5%	3.5%	4%
Total Score	100%	85.3%	85.1%	82.5%	71.1%



# Cost Comparison: TCO

## ▶ Canvas:

- **TCO:** \$2,130,600 (3 years)
- **Strengths:** Superior user experience, seamless integration, and scalability.
- **Trade-offs:** Highest cost; ideal for feature-rich, future-proof systems.

## ▶ Brightspace:

- **TCO:** \$1,407,360 (3 years)
- **Strengths:** Cost-effective with strong integration and existing user familiarity.
- **Trade-offs:** Backend usability challenges and limited advanced features.

## ▶ Blackboard Ultra:

- **TCO:** \$1,710,000 (3 years)
- **Strengths:** Robust grading and analytics tools.
- **Trade-offs:** Higher costs and less intuitive interface.

## ▶ Moodle:

- **TCO:** \$193,000 (3 years)
- **Strengths:** Extremely low cost, highly customizable.
- **Trade-offs:** Significant technical requirements and outdated interface.



# LMS Recommendation

- ▶ **Retain Brightspace as LMS of Choice**

- ▶ Transition costs (time, convenience, adjustment) outweigh the benefits of a new LMS.
- ▶ Brightspace is already integrated and widely recognized by the user base.

- ▶ **Migration to Canvas is Not Recommended**

- ▶ Slight usability advantage but outweighed by high costs and logistical demands.
- ▶ Faculty and student concerns about repeating the learning curve.

- ▶ **Focus on Improvements to Brightspace**

- ▶ Address grading system concerns raised by faculty.
- ▶ Negotiate contract enhancements for tailored improvements.

- ▶ **Stability and Continuity**

- ▶ Extend Brightspace contract for another 5 years.
- ▶ Provide a stable environment for users while implementing refinements.



# References

- ▶ Forbes Advisor. (2024). Best learning management systems (LMS) 2024. *Forbes Advisor*. <https://www.forbes.com/advisor/business/best-learning-management-systems/>
- ▶ D2L Corporation. (n.d.). Brightspace learning management system. *D2L*. <https://www.d2l.com/brightspace/>
- ▶ Instructure. (n.d.). Canvas LMS. *Instructure*. <https://www.instructure.com/canvas>
- ▶ SelectHub. (n.d.). Cost of ownership: Typical cost structure for Oracle learning management system. *SelectHub*. <https://www.selecthub.com/price-guides/lms-software.pdf>
- ▶ Gartner Research. (2024). Magic quadrant for learning management systems and corporate learning systems. *Gartner Research*. <https://www.gartner.com/en/research/methodologies/magic-quadrants-research>
- ▶ Data Bridge Market Research. (n.d.). Global learning management system market - industry trends and forecast to 2028. *Data Bridge Market Research*. <https://www.databridgemarketresearch.com/reports/global-learning-management-system-market>



Thank You





Questions?