SURVEY: COMPARISON AND EVALUATION STUDIES OF LEARNING CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Jamil Ahmad Itmazi ETSI, University of Granada, Spain Jamil_de_palestina@yahoo.com Miguel Gea Megías ETSI, University of Granada, Spain mgea@ugr.es

ABSTRACT

Most educational centers (e.g. universities, institutes, colleges) are adopting some kind of eLearning tool as an integral part of their learning systems; to enhance their traditional learning system or to create alternative models based on virtual learning.

An important resource for these eLearning solutions is the eLearning platform. Therefore, those eLearning centers have to choose the best package of LCMS suitable to their needs, because there are dozens of packages with diverse feature; some of them are commercial Software, while others are free Open Source (OSS).

This paper aims to help the educational centers by offering a survey of 58 comparison and evaluation studies of eLearning platforms. This survey shows that the eLearning sector needs to undertake more comprehensive and serious studies about LCMS comparison and evaluation, due to the rapid changes, substantial changes in each new version of the same package, and because of the fact that most of these 58 studies are partial, incomplete or already out of date.

This paper provides a brief introduction to eLearning platforms, and gives some useful information about each ICMS comparison and evaluation which is listed in this survey as well as analysis information over statistical analysis of those studies.

KEYWORDS - LCMS, LMS, CMS, eLearning platforms, Comparison, Evaluation.

1. INTRODUCTION

eLearning is becoming an important part of university learning management systems. Some educational centers are using eLearning to enhance their traditional learning system while others have created alternative models based on virtual learning and are using it as a new learning method.

eLearning can be defined as "the use of new multimedia technologies and the Internet to improve the quality of learning by facilitating access to resources and services as well as remote exchanges and collaboration", [Pla01]. eLearning is based on special purpose information system called LMS - Learning Management System, and is now being widely used in universities.

1.1 The Learning (Content) Management Systems

There are some concepts similar to eLearning platform (some of them with a small difference), e.g. LCMS (Learning content management system), LMS/ CMS (Learning/ Course Management System), Portal Learning and platform of eLearning. We will use the abbreviation LMS to represent those concepts.

The LMS is the eLearning platform which is considered as the important part of eLearning solutions from a university's viewpoint [Itm05], see Figure 1. The current software market of LMS packages "probably has at least 200 products", [Wil02].



Figure 1. The LMS within elearning.

LMS is the software that automates the administration of training events. All LM systems manage the login of registered users, manage course catalogs, track learner activities and results, and provide reports to management. An LMS may include additional functions such as: authoring of content, management of classroom training, learner collaboration tools (chat, discussion groups, etc.) [BRAa].

Nowadays, many university administrations have established departments or centers to manage issues of eLearning (e.g. eLearning center); which include:

- Propose the necessary changes in the system of the university.
- Decide the approach of eLearning implantation; to implement eLearning as apart of the existing system to enhance the traditional learning system or to establish a parallel system based on virtual learning.
- Decides to select the most suitable LMS platform,.
- Implementing the selected LMS and training the tutors, teachers and related employees.
- Maintain, develop and backup the system.
- Deciding to select the most suitable LMS platform is a difficult process, because there are dozens of packages (commercial properties ssoftware and OSS), as mentioned, with diverse feature.

2. LMS STUDIES OF COMPARISON & EVALUATION

This research is based on the studies or reports which make or partly make comparisons-evaluations of LMS. We do not claim to include all those studies here, but we include all the available studies we could find, after in depth research on the internet and in Granada University library until the beginning of 2005. Thus, some studies that have been removed from the internet or have not yet appeared there may not be included.

2.1 Considerations of chosen studies

In fact, the following points of view are taken into consideration when we review the 58 studies/reports:

- Some of the included studies are not necessarily published, because they are reports realized upon the request of a university, based on their internal needs.
- All the included studies have comparisons of LMSs (otherwise, papers which only have abstracts or explanations about LMSs are not taken into consideration).
- Any study which discusses the criteria of LMS comparison and evaluation without implementing those criteria on some LMSs, are not included, e.g. [SFU02/959; Man00/960].
- Each study has to include at least one comparison of two or more LMSs, so any study discussing only one LMS (even if it has some kind of evaluation) is not considered.
- Each study has to include some kind of criteria in its comparison process.

2.2 Studies information

This paper surveys 58 studies of comparison and evaluation of LMS. We would like to present the following clarifications about the study's abbreviations which appear in Table 1 in the appendix:

- Study name: the formal title of the study or the report.
- Year: the publishing (or implementation) year of the study.
- LMSs no. the number of LMSs used.
- List of LMSs names: the formal names (abbreviation names) of LMS used without the version number.
- Mainly: Y (Yes) if the study was designed mainly to make a comparison and evaluation of LMSs; otherwise N (No), means that it is part of the work.
- Rating type: the rating (evaluation) of the criteria, divide as; G (Grade): the rating is grade, X (existence): the rating based on existence and O (Open): the rating is an open evaluation.
- P.P: the page number of the study; otherwise (w) means a Web site or part of web site.
- OSS: Y (Yes) if the license of all LMSs on that study are OSS, M (Multi) means there OSS and properties-commercialsoftware; otherwise N (No), means all are commercial-properties software.
- The recommendations: we mention up to two names of the recommended LMSs, also we cannot mention names of LMSs if there is conditional recommendation.

3. THE ANALYSIS

The following analysis was based on Table 1, which is to be found in the appendix.

3.1 The recommended packages

Table 2, lists the names of recommended packages, as well as how many times each one was recommended. We give one point for every recommendation; therefore; if the study recommended two packages then each one

takes a half point. From that Table, upon all types of licenses, the WEBCT is the most recommended package with 9 out of 20 points, while blackboard occupied the second and Moodle the third. Upon OSS, Moodle is the most recommended OSS with 4 out of 7 points. See Figure 2.

Table 2: Th	e recommend	led packages
Name	Frequency	Recommendation LMSs
WebCT	9	
Blackboard	4,5	8 + -
Moodle	4	6
ATutor	2	
Brix	1	
EMU-LMS	1	
FirstClass	1	5 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &
Ilias	1	Were those wood store of the solar the solar solar
Janison	1	48° 4° 4°
TopClass	0,5	Package name
Total	20	Figure 2. The recommended packages

3.2 The Competition frequency for each LMS

The competition frequency for each LMS shows his popularity, because every study tried to compare the well known, famous and interesting packages at that time and taking of course from the views of the authors of those studies. Figure 3, shows every LMS with more than four occurrences in those comparisons studies.

all types of licenses, the WEBCT is the most popular package with 46 out of 362 points. Blackboard and Moodle are the followers. Moodle is the most popular OSS.



3.3 The growth of the studies with time

It is clear that the attention give to these kinds of studies has increased with time. Generally, every year there are more studies of this kind, though the year 2004 had less studies ⁽¹⁾ than 2003. Also we have not included 2005 in Figure 4, because we are still at the beginning of this year.



3.4 The dedications of the Studies

Some studies are –mainly- dedicated and designed to make a comparison and evaluation of some LMSs; while others are designed to conduct a study of some LMS, but not dedicated to achieving a comparison and evaluation of LMSs, so containing a comparison and evaluation of LMSs as well as other LMSs issues.

Table 4 / Figure 5, show that the majority of those studies are found to make LMSs evaluation and comparison.





3.5 The Type of evaluation

The types of rating (evaluation) are divided in this survey as: open, x, scale. Every type of evaluation takes one point if the study used it alone. If the study has two types, then half point to every type. See Figure 6, Table 5. Table 5. Evaluation type

These studies are evaluated in different ways.



3.6 Type of studies upon LMSs licenses



4. CONCLUSION

The need for eLearning, especially LMS for universities is increasing. Consequently, educational centers are adopting (or planning to adopt) LMS platforms. Because there are more than 200 LMS products, the people responsible try to evaluate some of them or review some evaluations and comparisons studies.

This research tries to help the administrations of universities, through the majority of the comparison and evaluation studies of LMSs, to facilitate the process of selecting the suitable LMS for their organization. Also, it

¹ About year 2004, we think that some studies may appear at the Internet after some months.

highlights the lack of serious studies to evaluate and compare LMSs and to emphasize the necessity of more analysis and studies of LMS. $\ .$

However, in conclusion, even if we have 58 studies or more, those studies are not sufficient to cover this important field of eLearning because some studies are not very precise, not comprehensive enough or contain weak criteria, so therefore it means that we still need more studies and metrics to compare effectively.

APPENDIX

Table 1. The Studies of LMSs Comparison & Evaluation

Study Name	Year	LMS No.	List of LMSs names	Mainly	Rating Type	PP	SSO	Recommendation
Ayb03-A Learning Management System Developed at the Eastern Mediterranean University	0 3	4	BB, WebCT, Net -Class, EMU-LMS	Y	х	W	N	EMU
Bav03- Administering an online learning community, Computer Science	0 3	3	WebCT, Moodle, KEWL	N	0	105	М	
Bes01- Learning Management System Evaluation Framework	0 1	2	WebCT, BB	Y	G	W	N	
Bla04 - e-Learning Competitive Landscape	0 4	5	BB, WebCT V., WebCT C., Desire2Learn, ANGEL	Y	х	18	N	BB
Bos02- Current comparison of WebCT, Blackboard, and Prometheus	0 2	3	WebCT, BB, Prometheus	Y	Х	W	N	Web CT
Bot04 - Functional Assessment of some Open- Source LMS	0 4	7	Claroline, Moodle, ATutor, Ilias, SpaghettiLearning, .LRN, BAZAAR	Y	х	18	Y	
Bri04 - A Framework for the Pedagogical Evaluation of eLearning Environments	0 4	10	WebCT V., BB, LearnWise, FirstClass, LAMS, COSE, Moodle, Bodington, Learndirect, UKEU	N	0	79	М	
Bri99- A Framework for Pedagogical Evaluation of Virtual Learning Environments	9 9	12	LS, WebCT, TopClass, Virtual-U, WCB, Asymetrix, FirstClass, BB, ARIADNE, CoMentor, CoSE, Learning Landscapes	N	x	46	N	
Bro01- Comparing Course Authoring Software: WebCT vs. Blackboard	0 1	2	WebCT, BB	Y	0	10	N	
Byr04- The Distribution and Features of Learning Management Systems in Australian Universities and Their Role in Student Assessment.	0 4	2	BB, WebCT V.	N	G	W	N	WebCT
Cat04- Technical Evaluation of Selected Learning Management Systems	0 4	3	ATutor, Ilias, Moodle	Y	G	44	Y	Moodle
CEN04 - Selection of an open source virtual learning environment for Universitat Jaume-I	0 4	3	ATutor, Moodle, .LRN	Y	0	28	Y	Moodle
CHE02 - VLE Comparison Grid	0 2	6	BB, fdlearning, LearnWise, Teknical, WebCT C., Wizlearn	Y	0	20	N	
CIT03- Groupware Comparison Groupware & UW-Eau Claire	0 3	3	LS, WebCT, BB	Y	0 X	W	N	
Cle03 - Virtual Learning Environment Comparison.	0 3	3	Moodle, Claroline, ATutor	Y	0	11	Y	ATutor
Com03 - COL LMS Open Source	0 3	35	After using some criteria with 35 LMSs the flowing a short list filtered: Moodle, LON-CAPA, ILIAS, .LRN, ATutor,	Y	G	22	Y	ATutor
Coo00- FirstClass vs. Blackboard	0 0	2	FirstClass, BB	Y	0	30	N	FirstClass
Cou00- Blackboard vs. WebCT	0 0	2	BB, WebCT	Y	O G	W	N	BB
CUE03 - Learning Management Systems for the Rest of Us	0 3	5	Claroline, Ganesha, Ilias, Moodle, Manhattan	Y	0	20	Y	Moodle

Dea01- Evaluation of Corporate Applications for Online Teaching and Learning	0 1	64 *	We mention 8 which selected after some criteria: Anlon, BB, eCollege, FirstClass, IVLE, Prometheus, L.Manager, WebCT	Y	0 G	W	N	WebCT
Dun03-Managed Learning Environments: issues for learning providers in Bedfordshire	0 3	6	BB, Teknical, Wizlearn Academic, WebCT, fdlearning , LearnWise	N	0 X	52	N	
Edu03- SVC Platform Evaluation Report	0 3	6	BB, Clix, WebCT V., Luvit, Globalteach, IBT Server	Y	0 X	W	N	
Edu04- EduTools	0 4	75	51 pack LMS: LRN, ANGEL, Embanet, Anlon, ATutor, Avilar WebMentor, Bazaar, BB, Bodington, BSCW, CentraOne, CHEF, Claroline, ClassWeb, Aspen, Colloquia, COSE, C.manager, Learnwise, LON-CAPA, Manhattan, MimerDesk, Moodle, Teknical, TeleTop, L.Manager, Enterprise, Unicon, Virtual-U, WebCT C., WebCT V., Whiteboard, CourseWork, DesireLearn, eCollege AU+, Educator, EduSystem, Eledge, ETUDES, FirstClass, Fle, Groove, HTMLeZ, ILIAS, NiceNet, IntraLearn, Janison, Jenzabar, Jones, KEWL, KnowEdge	Y	O X	W	М	
ET02- Comparison of BlackBoard and WebCT Course Management Platforms	0 2	2	BB, WebCT CE	Y	0	4	N	
Fi198- Distance Learning Environments Feature List	9 8	18	Classnet, CyberProf, Instructional Toolkit, LS, Mallard, netLearningPlace, PlaceWare, POLIS, L.Manager, Toolbox, TopClass, VCI, VOICE, WCB, WebCT, WISH, WLS	Y	X	W	N	
Fut00- Comparative Features Analysis of Leading Course Management Software	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	6	BB, IntraLearn, TopClass, VirtualU, WCB, WebCT	Y	G	45	N	WebCT
Gar03- Proyecto de evaluación de plataformas de teleformación para su implantación en el ámbito universitario	0 3	13	LRN, ATutor, Bazaar, Claroline, CLI Virtuoso, Chef, CourseWork Stanford, Fle3, ILIAS, Jones, LON-CAPA, Moodle, WebCT	Y	G	125	М	WebCT
Gib00- Comparison of Features, Tools, Specifications, Support, & Pricing	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	5	WCB, WebCt, BB, Top Class, LS.	Y	0 X	?	N	BB
Gol01- The LOTTS Project- Moving Forward Flexibly	0 1	4	Janison, BB, WebCT, Vettweb	Y	G O	12	N	Janison
Gro00- Comparison between two VLE: BSCW and WebCT	0 2	2	BSCW and WebCT	Y	0	W	N	
Gro00- Evaluation of two VLEs	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	2	BB, BSCW	Y	х	W	N	
Hal01 - Evaluation of Web-based Course Management Software from Faculty and Student User -Centered Perspectives	0 1	6	WebCT, BB, TopClass, Mad Duck, Intralearn, and Virtual-U.	Y	G X	58	N	BB & WebCT
Haz98- Evaluation and Selection of Web Course Management Tools	9 8	6	BB, WCB, LSS, TopClass, WebCT, WebMentor	Y	G	W	N	WebCT
Inf00- Course Management at Eastern Washington University	0 0	4	BB, eCollege, eSocrates, WebCt	N	0 X	38	N	
Ins03- Final report: Learning Management Systems	0 3	4	WebCT, BB, LS, EMU LMS	Y	Х	36	N	BB
Itm04 - E-LMIS: E-learning Management Integrated System in Asynchronous Way.	0 4	3	Ilias, Moodle, BSCW	N	0	137	Y	Moodle
Itm05 - A Comparison and evaluation of Open source learning managment sy stems	0 5	2	Ilias, Moodle	Y	0	7	Y	
Joh01 - Accessibility in Online Learning Management Systems	0 1	3	BB, Prometheus, WebCT	Y	0	W	N	
Kam03 - Online classrooms for FREE?! A Review of Free Online Learning Management Systems (LMS).	0 3	8	Yahoo! Groups, BSCW, Moodle, Fle3, Manhattan, ILIAS, ATutor, .LRN	Y	O X	W	Y	
KPA03-Review of Proposed Enterprise-wide Learning Management System	0 3	2	Course Work, BB	N	X	38	М	
Kri03- Evaluation von Learning Management Systemen (German Lang.)	0 3	90	the study mentioned only the second step of evaluation, which contain the following 15 LMS's: BB, Clix, DLS, Docent, Enterprise learning platform, eLS, IBT Server, iLearning, ILF, Ilias, LS, Saba, Sitos Cubix, Top Class, WebCT.	Y	G	W	М	Ilias

Lov02- New technologies applied to the education by means of the interaction person-computer	0 2	5	Angel, FirstClass, WebCT, eCollege, BB	Y	O X	43	N	WebCT
LTS02- Comparison between WebCT, Wolfware, and WebAssign	0 2	3	WebCT, WolfWare, WebAssign	Y	0	4	N	
Mal01- About Blackboard- Learning Management Systems Evaluation	0 1	2	Web CT, BB	Y	0	W	N	
Mar99- Comparison of Online Course Delivery Software Products Center for Instructional Technology	9 9	20	BB, Convene, Embanet, eCollege.com, IntraLearn, Symposium, TopClass, WebCT, L.Manager, WebMentor, LS, IVLE, Softarc, LUVIT, MEVW, IMSeries, Asymetrix Librarian, Serf, VIRTUAL-U, eduprise.com	Y	х	W	N	-
Mie02- The use of Learning Management Systems in the Czech Republic and Slovakia	0 2	6	LS, WebCT, GLN, Intralearn, Aspen	N	0	29	N	
O'D03- Architectural and functional design and evaluation of e-learning VUIS based on the proposed IEEE LTSA reference model	0 3	10	BB, Swift Author, Toolbook, Macromedia Authorware, QuestionMark Perception, TopClass Publisher, Mentergy Quest, InstallSh ield DemoShield, Prometheus, eCollege eCompanion	N	G	14	N	
OSC02- WebEd Tools Comparison Chart.	0 2	4	WebCT, BB, E-Education, Learning Bias	Y	0	W	N	
Pau02- Web-Education Systems in Europe	0 2	6	Tutor2000, WebCT, GLN, LS, Aspen, Intralearn	N	0	168	N	
Pei03 - Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools	0 3	2	Moodle, BB	N	O G	95	М	
Pre99- Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options	9 9	4	LS, Topclass, WCB, WebCT	N	х	-	N	
Rey03- Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating	0 3	19	Colloquia, CourseWork, econf., Eledge, MIT OCW, CHEF, ATutor, caroline, ClassWeb, eLecture, Moodle, Segue, Fle3, KEWL, Bazaar, LON-CAPA, MimerDesk, WeBWorK, LRN.	Y	G	W	Y	Multi
Saw04- BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 4 \end{array}$	3	WebCT, BB, BRIX	N	х	10	М	Brix
Sta03 - Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?	0 3	2	BB, WebCT	Y	0	18	Ν	
Tas02-WebCT vs. Blackboard	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 2\end{array}$	2	WebCT, BB	Y	0	77	N	WebCT
The97 - Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses	9 7	4	LS, top class, Webct, Toolbook	N	X	W	N	
Uni98- Recommendations for a Course Management / Collaboration Tool	9 8	7	Communicator, First Class, Net Forum, NiceNet, Top Class, WebCt, BB	Y	x	34	N	Top & WebCt
UPS03 - Learning Management Product Comparison Chart	0 3	5	Desire2Learn, WebCT, Angle, BB, WebCT V.	Y	X	6	N	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank the agency (AECI), which has provided me with a scholarship for my PhD, and the excellence doctoral program of the department of language and information systems at the University of Granada.

REFERENCES

Ayb03	Aybay, Isik; Dag, O. Oguz. 2003. A Learning Management System Developed at the Eastern Mediterranean University. Distance Education Institute. Eastern Mediterranean University. Magosa. North Cyprus. The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology - TOJET Apr. 2003. ISSN: 1303-6521 Vol 2, No. 2, Article 2. www.tojet.net/articles/222.htm
Bay03	Baving, T. 2003. Administering an online learning community, Computer Science Honours Project 2003, University of Cape
Durob	Town, Oct. 2003. http://simba.PS.uct.ac.za/~honsproj/cgi-
	bin/view/2003/baving_green.zip/baving_green/coursetool/downloads/AdminStation.pdf
Bes01	Beshears, F. M. 2001. Learning Management System Evaluation Framework. ETS Educational Technology Services.
	University of California-Berkeley. Mar. 2001.USA. http://ist-socrates.berkeley.edu/~fmb/articles/lms_eval/
Bla04	Blackboard Inc. 2004. e-Learning Competitive Landscape. Blackboard Inc. retrieved online at 30. Dec. 2004.

	www.blackboard.com/doPS/AS/Bb_Academic_Suite_Whitepaper_Competitor_Comparison.pdf
Bos02	Boston University. 2002. Current comparison of WebCT, Blackboard, and Prometheus.
	Web Central Research. Boston University, Mar. 2002 Boston. www.bu.edu/webcentral/research/courseware/index.html
Bot04	Botturil, L. 2004. Functional Assessment of some Open Source LMS, (eLab report). University of Italian Switzerland.
	November 2004. www.istituti.usilu.net/botturii/web/publications/OS_review_Nov2004.pdf
Bri04	Britani, S. and Elber, O. 2004. A Framework for the Pedagogical Evaluation of eleaning Environments. This report is the result of a project based at Bolton Institute - 1UK and funded by IISC. Feb. 2004.
	www.cetis.ac.uk/members/fieles/thMeet_framework/VLFfulReport
Bri99	Britain, S. and Liber, O. 1999. A Framework for Pedagogical Evaluation of Virtual Learning Environments. Report of JTAP -
	JISC Technology Applications. UK. October 1999. www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/jtap-041.doc
Bro01	Brooks, S. 2001. Comparing Course Authoring Software: WebCT vs. Blackboard. P aper for the course EDC385G, Multimedia
	Authoring, at the University of Texas. USA. www.edb.utexas.edu/multimedia/PDFfolder/WebCTvsBlackboard.pdf
Byr04	Byrnes, R., Ellis, A. 2004. The Distribution and Features of Learning Management Systems in Australian Universities and
	http://ausweb.scu.etu.au/a/papers/refereed/bwrnes/paper.html
G .04	Catalyst IT Limited 2004 Technical Evaluation of Selected Learning Management Systems Catalyst IT Limited the New
Cat04	Zealand Open Source Virtual Learning Environment project. The open polytechnic of New Zealand. 2004. New Zealand.
	http://eduforge.org/docman/view.php/7/18/LMS%20Technical%20Evaluation%20-%20May04.pdf
CEN04	CENT. 2004. Selection of an open source virtual learning environment for Universitat Jaume I. Centre d'Educació i Noves
GUEGO	Tecnologies (CENT) de la Universitat Jaume I. may. 2004. http://cent.uji.es/doc/eveauji_en.pdf
CHE02	CHEST. 2002. VLE Comparison Grid. CHEST (Combined Higher Education Software Team). Updated Dec. 2002.
CIT03	WWW.eduselv.olg.uk/citest/datasets/vie/
01105	Innovation University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Dec. 2003 Wisconsin USA, www.uwc.edu/citi/groupware/compare.htm
Cle03	Clements, I. 2003. Virtual Learning Environment Comparison. Report written at Progress through Training. Aug. 2003.
	www.atutor.ca/atutor/files/VLE_comparison.pdf
Com03	Commonwealth. 2003. COL LMS Open Source. The Commonwealth of Learning and 3waynet Inc. June 25, 2003.
G 00	www.col.org/Consultancies/03LMSOpenSource.pdf
Coo00	Cook, K. Davies, 1. 2000. FirstClass vs. Blackboard. An opinion paper: How Blackboard compares to FirstClass in delivering online courses. Canadian postsecondary educational institution. Mar 2000, www.edu.teachnet/ECVBR pdf
G 00	Courseware evaluation committee, 2000 Blackboard vs. WebCT Courseware evaluation committee of The University of
Cou00	Texas at Austin to compare the two finalists in UT's search for course server tools: WebCT and Blackboard. Mar. 2000.
	Austin. USA. www.utexas.edu/academic/blackboard/about/atut/evalIntro.html
CL TO A	CUE. 2003 Learning Management Systems for the Restof Us: An Assessment of Open Source Learning Management
CUE03	Systems. White Paper Open Source Learning Management Systems. A research report presented by CUE (Corporate
Dea01	University Enterprise), Inc, May 1, 2005. www.uv.es/ucape/pdi/CUE-LIMS%20winte%20Paper.pdi Deakin university, Evaluation of Corporate Applications for Online Teaching and Learning, Working Party and Consultative
Deaoi	Group. Deakin University. Last updated in Nov. 2001. Australia. www.deakin.edu.au/teachlearn/Ims-evaluation
Dun03	Dunstable College. 2003. Managed Learning Environments issues for learning providers in Bedfordshire. Bedfordshire and
Dunos	Luton Learning Partnership. MLE development. Dunstable, Bedfordshire. April 2003. www.learning-
E 1.02	partnership.co.uk/pdfs/reports/0203B_MLE_ISSU.DOC
Edu03	Edutech. 2005. SVC Platform Evaluation Report. (Evaluation of LMISS) by Monnard. J, Brugger, R. Edutech. I nis web site is maintained by Centre NTE. University of Eribourg, Edutech. March 2003, www.edutech.ch/lms/ev2.php
Edu04	EduTools, 2004. Course Management Systems, Site of EduTools, WCET©2004 (The Western Cooperative for Educational
	Telecommunications). Reviewed on 31/12/2004. www.edutools.info/course
ET02	ET@MO. 2002. Comparison of BlackBoard and WebCT Course Management Platforms. ET@MO. Educational Technologies
2102	at Missouri Teaching and Technology Sessions (TN'Ts). Nov. 2002. University of Missouri. Columbia. USA.
E:109	http://etatmo.missouri.edu/courses/resources/comparison.htm
ГП96	rie, J. 1998. Distance Leanning Environments reature List. Instructional Software Development Group, information
Fut00	FutureU, 2000. Comparative Features Analysis of Leading Course Management Software. The University of the Future Jan.
1 4100	2000. San Francisco, CA. USA. www.futureu.com/cmscomp/cms_comp.html
Gar03	García D. Castell, S. 2003. Proyecto de evaluación de plataformas de teleformación para su implantación en el ámbito
	universitario. Final Project of Bachelor, computer engineering. University of Valencia. Sep. 2003.
	WWW.UV.es/IICape/doPS/darlo/mem-darlo-V8.pdl
Gib00	conducted by Wichita State University Jan 2000 Kansas USA. The original link
	www.mrc.twsu.edu/mrc/im2/websystems.htm and the comparison at http://www2.ewu.edu/techres/ims/FeatureMatrix.pdf
	Goldman, M. 2001. The LOTTS Project- Moving Forward Flexibly. Paper based on The Learning Online Teaching &
Gol01	Tracking Systems (LOTTS) Project at Tropical North Queensland Institute of TAFE (TNQIT). NET* Working 2001. From
	Virtual to Reality. An Online Learning Conference in Brisbane, Queensland, Brisbane convention center. 15-17. Oct. 2001.
	www.flexiblelearning.net.au/nw2001/01_attending/program/tuesday.htm Group 20, 2000, Evoluation of two VI Fe, Group 20 of Workgroup 1. University of Searland and university of Innehruek. Jun
Gro00	2000 German, http://seminar.jura.uni-
	sb.de/publ/ss00/seminar/ss2000/int/groupwork1/g29/files/submission%20group%20work%2029.html
Gro00	Group 30. Comparison between two VLE: BSCW and WebCT. Groupwork 1: Group 30, University of Saarland and
GIUUU	University of Innsbruck. 2000. Germany http://seminar.jura.uni-
	sb.de/publ/ss00/seminar/ss2000/int/groupwork1/g30/files/grupp_30_2.htm Halloran P. M. 2001 Evaluation of Wab based Course Management Software from Feaulty and Student User. Contered
Hal01	Perspectives (Phase I of the USAFA Cadet Personalized Educational Portal Project) Institute for Information Technology
	Applications. Nov. 2001. USA. www.usafa.af.mil/iita/publications.htm
Haz98	Hazari, S. 1998. Evaluation and Selection of Web Course Management Tools. Ed.D. Robert H. Smith School of Business.
	University of Maryland, College Park. USA. www.sunilhazari.com/education/webct/
Inf00	Information Resources. 2000. Course Management at Eastern Washington University. A Whitepaper Prepared by st aff of

	Client Services. Information Resources. Fall 2000. Eastern Washington University. USA.
	http://www2.ewu.edu/techres/ims/whitepaper.html
Ins03	Insel, s. 2003. Final report: Learning Management Systems. Modelling multimedia systems. Eastern Mediterranean University.
	Turkey. 24. Jan.2003. http://sct.emu.edu.tr/sinem/finalreport.doc
Itm04	Itmazi, J. Gea, M. M. 2004. E-LMIS: E-learning Management Integrated System in Asynchronous Way, To Support Learning
	in the Traditional and Open Universities, Research Dissertation of the Advanced Studies Diploma, Granada University,
	Department of Languages and information Systems, Granada, Span, Jun. 2004.
Itm05	International Conference - Applied Computing 2005 Algarve, Portugal 22-25 Feb 2005
	www.iadis.net/dl/Search list open.asp?code=1189
Joh01	Johnson, A. Ruppert, S. 2001. Accessibility in Online Learning Management Systems (LMSs). Project in the University of
	Wisconsin Oshkosh. Nov. 2001. USA. www.uwosh.edu/programs/accessibility/papers/
Kam03	Kameron, S. E. 2003. Online classrooms for FREE?! A Review of Free Online Learning Management Systems (LMS). TESL-
920	EJ. Vol. 7. No. 2. M-2. Sep. 2003. http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej26/m2.html
KPA03	Consulting Dry Ltd. Austrolia The report realized for the University of Melbourne. Son 2002. Austrolia
	http://talmet.meu.unimelb.edu.au/
Kri03	Kristöfl, R. 2003. Evaluation von Learning Management Systemen. Austrian Federal Ministry of education science and culture
	(BMBWK). www.virtual-learning.at/evalplattform.htm
Lov02	Lovelle, J. et al. 2002. New technologies applied to the education by means of the interaction person-computer. Doctorate in
20102	engineering of software. Faculty of computer science. Pontifical university of Salamanca. Oct. 2002. (The Document in
I TOOO	Spanish Language). www.geocities.com/malvaope/evaluacionherram-educacion.doc
L1502	LIS. 2002. Comparison between webC1, worrware, and webAssign. LIS - Learning Technology Service, NC (North Carolina) State University USA. The site last modified on Jun 2002 http://lts.pPSu.edu/tools/putting_online.html
Mal01	Malone, T. 2001, About Blackboard- Learning Management Systems Evaluation. Blackboardsupport. Last modified
	11/09/2001. http://blackboardsupport.calpoly.edu/content/about/eval.html
Mar99	Marshall University. 1999. Comparison of Online Course Delivery Software Products. Center for Instructional Technology.
100	Marshall University. Last updated on October 1999. USA. www.marshall.edu/it/cit/webct/compare/comparison.html
Mie02	Mièincová, M. 2002. The use of Learning Management Systems in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Team of the Project WEB-
	O'Droma M S. Ganchey I & McDonnell E 2003. Architectural and functional design and evaluation of e-learning VIIIS
O'D03	based on the proposed IEEE LTSA reference model. The Internet and Higher Education ISSN: 1096-7516. 6 (3) P.p. 263-276
	www.ul.ie/~odroma/ Architectural%20and%20functional%20%20Internet%20and%20HE%202003.pdf
05002	OSC. 2002. WebEd Tools Comparison Chart. OSC© (Ohio Supercomputer Center).
05002	www.osc.edu/education/webed/Tools/chart.shtml
Pau02	Paulsen, M.F, Keegan, D., Dias, A., Dias, P., Pimenta, P., Fritsch, H., Föllmer, H., Micincova, M., Olsen, G. 2002. Web-
	- $ -$
	Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. FernUniversität– Hagen, ISSN1455-9340. Oct. 2002. www.fernun- hagen de/ZIEE/ZP_118 pdf
D.:02	hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard. An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into
Pei03	 Education Systems in Europe. 2.Iff Paptere, 118. FerrOniversitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.fernunF hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural
Pei03	 Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. Performersitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.fernunf- hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf
Pei03 Pre99	Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. Performerstat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.fernunf- hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University.
Pei03 Pre99	Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. PernOniversitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.fernunf- hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information_www.library.okstate.edu/dl/(prestamo/nom/index.htm)
Pei03 Pre99 Rev03	Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. Performersitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.fernunf- hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Revnolds. R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies.
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03	Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. Performersitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remunif- hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03	Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. Performersitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remninf hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning.
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04	Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. Performentersitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remninf hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04	 Education Systems in Europe. 21ff Papiere, 118. PernOniversitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remninfhagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lit.iPS.hawaii.edu/lit/appers/2004/sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03	 Education Systems in Europe. 21ff Papiere, 118. PernOniversitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remunif-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nevamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lilt.iPS.hawaii.edu/lilt/papers/2004/Sawatpanit.et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic, Technologies. University of Iowa. USA Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02	 Education Systems in Europe. 21ff Papiere, 118. Performersitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remunif-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004. Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lilt.iPS.hawaii.edu/lilt/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002.
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02	 Education Systems in Europe. 21ff Papiere, 118. Performersitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remunif-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lilt.iPS.hawaii.edu/lilt/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97	 Education Systems in Europe. 21ff Papiere, 118. Performersitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remunif-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lit.iPS.hawaii.edu/lit/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba.
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97	 Education Systems in Europe. 21ft Papiere, 118. FernUniversitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.rerunni-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ptt/PILinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lilt.iPS.hawaii.edu/lilt/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/courseware/index.html
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98	 Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Paptere, 118. FernUniversitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remulti-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PlLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004. Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lit.iPS.hawaii.edu/lilt/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.weu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/courseware/index.html University of Pittsburgh. 1998. Recommendations for a Course Management / Collaboration Tool, report made b
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98	 Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. FerriUniversitat – Hagen, ISSN14359340. Oct. 2002. www.ternunihagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nonvindex.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lilt.iPS.hawaii.edu/lilt/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/courseware/index.html University of Pittsburgh. 1998. Recommendations for a Course Management / Collaboration Tool, report made by the committee formed by a consortium of the Center for CIDDE), ULS and CIS. University of Pittsburgh. Apri
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98 UPS03	 Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. FernUniversitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9540. Oct. 2002. www.remunihagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://ilt.iPS.hawaii.edu/ilt/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.weu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/courseware/index.html University of Pittsburgh. 1998. Recommendations for a Course Management / Collaboration Tool, report made by t
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98 UPS03	Education Systems in Europe. 21ff Papiere, 118. PernOniversitat – Hagen, ISSN 1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.fernun- hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D, Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEE). 2004. http://lit.iPS.hawaii.edu/lit/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Pittsburgh. 1998. Recommendations for a Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Pittsburgh. 1998. Recommendations for a Course Management / Collaboration Tool, report made by the committee formed by a consortium of the Center for CIDDE), ULS and CIS. University of Pittsburgh. April. 1998. Pittsburgh
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98 UPS03 SFU02	 Education Systems in Europe. 21ff Paptere, 118. FernUniversitat – Hagen, ISSN143559340. Oct. 2002. www.remuni-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lilt.iPS.hawaii.edu/lilt/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/courseware/index.html University of Pittsburgh. 1998. Recommendations for a Course Management
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98 UPS03 SFU02	 Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. Ferri Universitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.ferrium-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexames.nl/ppt/PlLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004. Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lit.iPS.hawaii.edu/lit/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/courseware/index.html University of Pittsburgh. 1998. Recommendations for a Course Management / Collaboration Tool, report made by the committee formed by a consortium of the Center for CIDDE), ULS and CIS. Univer
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98 UPS03 SFU02	 Education Systems in Europe. Ziff Papiere, 118. Ferri Universitat – Hagen, ISSN1435-9340. Oct. 2002. www.remulti-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexames.nl/ppt/PlLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lilt.iPS.hawaii.edu/lilt/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are they succeed and comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/courseware/index.html University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/course
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98 UPS03 SFU02 Man00	 Education Systems in Europe. 2.Iff Papiere, 118. Ferritoriversitat – Hagen, ISSN14359340. Oct. 2002. www.fernuni-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nexamens.nl/pt/PlLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25. 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M. Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004. Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://lit.iPS.hawaii.edu/lit/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard, Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/iptools/courseware/index.html University of Pittsburgh. 1998. Recommendations for a Course Management /
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98 UPS03 SFU02 Man00	Education Systems in Europe. 21ff Paptere, 118. FemUniversitat – Hageh, ISSN14359540. Oct. 2002. www.wretenum- hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/pt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating. Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25, 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE), 2004. http://lit.IPS.hawaii.edu/lil/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/it/cio/planning/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.a/ip/tools/courseware/index.html University of Pittsburgh. 1998. Recommendations for a Course Management / Collaboration Tool, report made by the committee formed by a consortium of the Center for CIDDE), ULS and CIS. Univer
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98 UPS03 SFU02 Man00 BRAa	 Education Systems in Europe. 21ff Papiere, 118. FemUniVersitat – Hageh, ISSN14359540. Oct. 2002. www.vertuni-hagen.de:ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nvexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware Evaluation and Rating Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25, 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M, Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE), 2004. http://lit.iPS.hawaii.edu/il/to/parts/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.ue.udu/it/cio/planing/cmsfinalreport.pdf The University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/courseware/index.html University of Taskforce. 2003. Learning Management Product Comparison Chart.
Pei03 Pre99 Rey03 Saw04 Sta03 Tas02 The97 Uni98 UPS03 SFU02 SFU02 Man00 BRAa	 Education Systems in Europe. 21ft Paptere, 118. FemUniversitat – Hagen, ISSN143539340. Oct. 2002. www.eremulti-hagen.de/ZIFF/ZP_118.pdf Pei-Jun, L. 2003. Moodle versus Blackboard, An Experiment on Saving Instructor Time by Integrating Peer Assessment into Web-based Learner Support Tools. Master thesis. "Education and Training System Design" Program. Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. University of Twente. The Netherlands. Dec. 2003. www.nexamens.nl/ppt/PJLinThesis.pdf Prestamo, A. 1999. Putting Your Course Online: A Comparison of Courseware Options. Oklahoma State University. Presentation for the Twentieth National Online Meeting, New York - May 20, 1999. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc. In Press. Some information, www.library.okstate.edu/dls/prestamo/nom/index.htm Reynolds, R. 2003. Open Source Courseware-Evaluation and Rating Xplana.com: under Category: Emerging Technologies. 04.25, 2003. www.xplana.com/whitepapers/archives/Open_Source_Courseware Sawatpanit, M. Suthers, D., Fleming, S. 2004. BRIX: Meeting the Requirements for Online Second Language Learning. Proceedings of the HIPSS-37, January 5-8, 2004, Wakoloa, Hawaii (CD-ROM), CA: Institute of Electrical and ElectroniPS Engineers, Inc. (IEEE). 2004. http://ilit.iPS.hawaii.edu/ilit/papers/2004/Sawatpanit-et-al-2004.pdf Staff at Academic Technologies. 2003. Blackboard 6 and WebCT 4: What are their similarities? Their differences?. ITS Academic Technologies. University of Iowa. USA. Dec. 3, 2003. http://courses.uiowa.edu/comparison. Task Force. 2002. WebCT vs. Blackboard. Report of the Course Management Task Force. December 2002. www.wcu.edu/itioba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Canada. www.umanitoba.ca/ip/tools/courseware/index.html University of Manitoba. 1997. Tools for Developing Interactive Academic Web Courses. The University of Manitoba. Feb. 1997. Winnipeg. MB. Ca