

# Course Delivery Tools Decision Matrix

**Figure 1**

*Criteria and Rationale*

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Significance Rating</b> 1–5 scale	<b>Rationale</b> [For each criterion, compose 1–2 sentences about why it’s a priority for you when selecting the best course authoring tool. Cite the sources you use to support your decision. Follow APA format for these in-text citations and references. Include the full reference in the References section below.]
Free vs. paid features	5	The tool must be sustainable and freely available without time-limited trials, ensuring accessibility for low-income schools (EDUCAUSE, 2014).
Accessibility features	5	Alignment with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) guidelines is critical for supporting multilingual learner students with disabilities (CAST, 2018).
Bonus features for learners	3	Additional features like badges or collaboration spaces can increase engagement but are not essential to meeting core objectives.
Layout and visual appeal	4	A consistent, clear layout reduces cognitive load and support navigation for struggling readers (Quality matters, 2023).
Add-ons and integrations	4	The ability to embedded Google Docs, YouTube, or interactive tools supports multimodal literacy instruction (CAST, 2018).
Synchronous/asynchronous interaction support	3	Both synchronous (live sessions) and asynchronous (discussion boards) tools are valuable for collaboration but not as critical as core assessments.
Discussion board capabilities	4	Discussions build confidence and collaboration, supporting SEL objectives for diverse learners (Brookfield & Preskill, 2016).
Navigation (ease of use and course/module organization)	5	Clear module structure aligns with QM 8.1 and is essential for student independence in navigating content (Quality Matters, 2023).

Criteria	Significance Rating 1–5 scale	Rationale [For each criterion, compose 1–2 sentences about why it’s a priority for you when selecting the best course authoring tool. Cite the sources you use to support your decision. Follow APA format for these in-text citations and references. Include the full reference in the References section below.]
File size or storage limitations	2	While important, file size limitations can often be worked around with external hosting (YouTube, Drive).
[custom criterion 1 – your choice]	5	Stakeholders must view the course via a link without creating accounts; critical for meeting assignment and ePortfolio requirements (Instructure, 2024; Google, n.d.).
[custom criterion 2 – your choice]	5	Tools must support quizzes, assignments, and authentic assessments aligned to objectives (Quality Matters, 2023).

**Figure 2***Decision Matrix*

Criteria	Significance Rating 1–5 scale	Quality Score for Tool 1 1–5 scale	Tool 1 Weighted/Final Score	Significance Rating 1–5 scale	Quality Score for Tool 2 1–5 scale	Tool 2 Weighted/Final Score
Free vs. paid features	5	5	25	5	5	25
Accessibility features	5	4	20	5	4	20
Bonus features for learners	3	3	9	3	3	9
Layout and visual appeal	4	5	20	4	4	16
Add-ons and integrations	4	5	20	4	4	16
Synchronous/asynchronous interaction support	3	4	12	3	3	9

Criteria	Significance Rating 1–5 scale	Quality Score for Tool 1 1–5 scale	Tool 1 Weighted/Final Score	Significance Rating 1–5 scale	Quality Score for Tool 2 1–5 scale	Tool 2 Weighted/Final Score
Discuss board capabilities	4	5	20	4	4	16
Navigation (ease of use and course organization)	5	5	25	5	4	20
File size or storage limitations	2	4	8	2	3	6
[custom criterion 1 – your choice]	5	5	25	5	5	25
[custom criterion 2 – your choice]	5	5	25	5	3	15
<b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>			<b>209</b>			<b>177</b>

## Summary

After evaluating both tools, Canvas (Free-for-Teacher) is the stronger choice for delivering my online course. Canvas scored higher in areas critical to my learners, such as assessment workflow, discussion board capabilities, and structured navigation. Its “Modules” feature aligns with Quality Matters Standard 8.1 by ensuring consistency across all units, while Assignments and Quizzes support both formative and summative assessments (Quality Matters, 2023).

Google Sites provides flexibility, ease of authoring, and seamless integration with Google Workspace. It allows public, account-free access, making it a strong showcase platform. However, its assessment and analytics functions are less robust, and discussions require external tools like Padlet. While Sites would work well for lightweight delivery, Canvas provides the comprehensive structure and features necessary to meet instructional and assessment needs for my Title I, diverse, and technology-reliant learners.

## References

Brookfield, S. D., & Preskill, S. (2016). *The discussion book: 50 great ways to get people talking*. John Wiley & Sons.

CAST. (2018). *Universal design for learning (UDL) guidelines version 2.2*. CAST. <https://udlguidelines.cast.org/>

EDUCAUSE. (2014). *Selecting a learning management system: Advice from an academic perspective*. EDUCAUSE Review. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2014/4/selecting-a-learning-management-system-advice-from-an-academic-perspective>

Google. (n.d.). *Google Sites* [Website creation tool]. Google Support. <https://sites.google.com/>

Instructure. (2024). *Canvas* [Learning management system]. Instructure. <https://www.instructure.com/canvas>

Quality Matters. (2023). *QM higher education rubric* (7th ed.). Quality Matters. <https://www.qualitymatters.org/qa-resources/rubric-standards/higher-ed-rubric>