

**VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION CENTER**

DISTANCE LEARNING TASK FORCE

MARCH 13, MARCH 20, MARCH 25

LMS Vendor Demos 2009

Attendance: Ann Bittl, Betsy Wagner, Brenda Shubert, Dave Fuhrmann, Heather Untalan, Julie Lovejoy, Krista Wilbur, Lisa Miller, Marc Boman, Martin Chetlen, Mike Rose, Rick Shaw, Teresa Bonham, Tim McGrath, Victory Kitamura

Vendor demos were conducted over three days. Each vendor was given ninety minutes to present their product following this basic format:

- Introductions
- Company information (years in business, company size, number of clients, etc.)
- An overview of the product and service offerings
- Demonstration of the product
- Question and Answer session
- Closing statement

The reviews are as follows:

1. Vendor: MoodleRooms

The group felt that the demo only skimmed the surface, that a more in-depth look at the features is needed. The group was comfortable with the functionality; it would meet the needs of most faculty. It has a simpler and more intuitive interface than Blackboard/WebCT. There is no loss of major features but lacked some additional features that would be nice to have.

2. Vendor: rSmart

Overall the group did not seem impressed possibly because of the way the demo was presented. The product seemed complicated and confusing with too many features. There also seemed to be limited integration with publishers and other vendors and a lack of consistency among the tools.

3. Vendor: Desire to Learn

The group felt that the interface was clean and consistent; all major requirements were met with some attractive additional features. There are many features that are add-ons that increase the cost. There might be a learning curve for some users but the product seems very intuitive. Good integration with publishers, Wimba, Turn-it-In, etc.

4. Vendor: Etudes

Overall the group did not seem impressed with Etudes. The features are limited and not generally intuitive. There is not enough integration with publishers and other vendors to meet the needs of all faculty. The development is driven by a small group of institutions.

5. Vendor: Angel

The group did seem impressed with this product. There is no loss of features and includes many additional features. It does allow an avatar/picture in the bio that can be seen in some of the communication tools. It allows multimedia to be used and uploaded in many tools. It has a date-rollover tool that everyone was excited about. It has an auto-grade feature in discussions that seems relatively easy to set up and use and which would be very handy for faculty. It has good integration with publishers and other vendors so many of the tools faculty currently use would be able to function as part of this new system. They offer some migration from Blackboard which everyone was happy to hear. In general it was a very enthusiastic response to the possibility of using this system in the future.

6. Vendor: Blackboard

Overall the group did not seem impressed. Several features were not available in their current release, and possibly available in some future release. Many of the desired tools were not a part of the product, but provided by other vendors. It seemed that the learning curve for retraining faculty would be at least as long, if not longer than some of the other systems which seemed to have better features, cleaner interfaces and smaller price tags.