Uday Chhina
A01210638

Module 8 Assignment

Part 1:

There are two cases of the implementation of a new LMS system: one where the existing LMS is upgraded with new features, and the case where BCIT completely abandons the existing LMS and switches over to a new one.

In the first case, I would choose Phased Implementation. New features can be added one by one and while the older ones are taken out of operation.

In the case where BCIT switches over to a completely new LMS, I would choose the Parallel Implementation methodology. Both the new system and the old system can run in parallel for a period of time so that students can get used to the newer system, *before* they have to switch over.

Part 2:

For the first case, where only newer features are adopted, direct cutover, pilot, and parallel implementation methodologies are not the best choice. Direct cutover methodology poses a risk to students, instructors, and the IT staff. This will cause general confusion among the users and an increase in the troubleshooting and help tickets that the IT staff will have to attend to. Parallel implementation of features introduces duplication of work and support is required for both systems. Pilot implementation would lead to a sudden switch of all the new features after it's done being tested by the pilot group and it is not beneficial for the students, instructors, or the staff.

For the case where BCIT (a not-for-profit organization) abandons the older LMS, we need parallel implementation because it is the least risky for the users. Direct cutover is the riskiest implementation method for both the vendor of the LMS and the users. Problems, logic of the system and other essential functions are going to be live tested by the users and if they don't work properly, it could lead to a loss in productivity and the day-to-day flow of the organization. Pilot implementation doesn't work for the same reason as direct cutover. BCIT as an organization can't afford to have all of its students subjected to a new system without time to adjust even if it is tested to have no problems with a smaller group of students. The loss of productivity and the confusion and stress due to the new system is not what the students, instructors, or IT staff need. Since both are different systems, the work required to make smaller features of both of the systems to compatible with each other to make it possible to have phased implementation is not beneficial due to the cost of development it adds.

Parallel implementation makes the most sense for this case as it let's all users time to adjust to the new system but also makes it possible to fall back to the older system in case features in the newer system are not working.