



NATIONAL LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE'S TOOLKIT 2005 PROGRAM EVALUATION

Summary & Tools

Chapter Summary

Objective

- To establish a collection of questions and critical issues for framing and building capacity for successful eLearning evaluations.
- To include within this framework: eLearning categories; goals; indicators; measures; lessons learned; models; and state eLearning initiatives.

Key Questions

- What are the effective models for evaluation of eLearning programs?
 - ◆ What are characteristics of these evaluations (e.g. benchmarks, criteria, approach, considerations)?
 - ◆ What are the lessons learned?
 - ◆ What are the pitfalls?
 - ◆ What can we learn from the federal evaluation grants and the approaches the states are taking to program evaluation?
- How do Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) build capacity to facilitate and maintain project evaluation?
- How do states fund their evaluations?

NLI Work Group Process

Addressing core goals outlined in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), the Program Evaluation Work Group collaborated during the State Educational Technology Directors Association's (SETDA) 2004 National Leadership Institute (NLI) to determine how to support and guide states in conducting successful eLearning evaluations.

The Program Evaluation Work Group was firm in the notion that evaluation is not research. The purpose of an evaluation is to find out how a program is working and to make decisions about improvement and continuation. Therefore, the group reached consensus that the purpose for the Program Evaluation section of the toolkit was not to provide a "how-to guide" for evaluation, because there are numerous high-quality and respectable guides that currently exist. Instead, the goal of the NLI work group was to provide states with a set of questions and critical issues to consider when describing and defining the components of a successful eLearning program. These critical questions and issues can be seen as a framework that can be used when: 1) developing RFPs; 2) working with school district grant awardees; 3) providing projects with criteria to consider in hiring outside evaluators; and 4) identifying and collecting project data elements that could be aggregated and used in a statewide evaluation.

During the 2004 NLI, Program Evaluation Work Group members participated in a consensus-building process which was fueled by sophisticated discussions centered on the complex issues that surround eLearning program evaluation. Participants began by sharing ideas that informed the final toolkit efforts. Early discussions included:

- Making a distinction between program and project evaluation according to the National Science Foundation definitions;
- Developing a common ground on how to evaluate programs from different funding sources;
- Establishing parameters for program evaluation;
- Producing different criteria for evaluating various eLearning programs (e.g. resources, online courses, virtual schools, professional development, distance learning); and
- Recognizing the need to identify the consumer/audience of an evaluation.

The Work Group decided to establish broad components that transcend all possible definitions of eLearning and to develop a framework for eLearning evaluation centered on program goals and objectives. The resulting product balances the overall umbrella evaluation approach versus state-specific projects. Subsequently, participants categorized types of eLearning programs into three areas: 1. Student-centered projects; 2. Educator-centered projects; and 3. Resource-centered projects.

The Work Group then considered technical, implementation, educational, and institutional aspects for each of the three eLearning categories and identified the following primary outcomes associated with these types of programs:

- Increase equity and access;
- Increase and improve teaching and learning;
- Increase community and collegial collaboration as well as parent involvement;
- Increase efficiency;
- Increase choice and the opportunity to learn; and
- Capitalize on any positive unintended outcomes.

In addition, resource specialists in the group created a list of guiding questions for states to consider before engaging in program evaluation.

SETDA Tool Developed to Assist States

- **ELearning Evaluation Lens:** a progressive way to consider critical issues and questions that frame successful eLearning program evaluations including components such as categories, goals, indicators, measures, lessons learned, models, and state eLearning initiatives.

Possible Next Steps and Recommendations

- Continue to collect case studies to add to the eLearning Evaluation Lens;
- Identify additional models, examples, and resources to add to the eLearning Evaluation Lens;
- Develop a matrix that displays funding models currently in use by states that includes examples of states using the various models presented as well as a collection of supporting documents that states use in connection with funding including tools such as outlines and templates;
- Explore all resources and create an annotated bibliography of solid scientifically-based resources;
- Conduct self-studies utilizing the tools created during the NLI; and
- Brainstorm strategies to utilize when presenting a multitude of data to various stakeholders and clients (i.e. in terms that are easy to understand and digest).

eLearning Evaluation Lens

Participation in the Program Evaluation Work Group was an intense, but rewarding experience. Descriptions of the work group process at the National Leadership Institute 2004 (NLI) indicate that it was a time for “synergy of discussion,” “one-stop shopping for quality resources,” “breaking out of state isolation,” “refining thinking about program evaluation,” and “realizing that the sum is greater than all of the parts.”

The Program Evaluation Work Group aspired to address core goals outlined in the No Child Left Behind, Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology (NCLB II D) program during the State Educational Technology Directors Association’s (SETDA) 2004 meeting by determining how to support and guide states in conducting successful eLearning evaluations. Program evaluation is a vital component of eLearning initiatives with the ultimate aim of improving student learning and overall quality of education through technology.

Aware that evaluation is not research, and that the purpose of an evaluation is to find out how a program is working and to make decisions about improvement and capacity-building, the Program Evaluation Work Group intended for the following tool to be used as a lens or framework by states when describing and defining the components of a successful eLearning program. States can use this lens when: 1) developing RFPs; 2) working with school district grant awardees; 3) providing projects with criteria to consider in hiring outside evaluators; and 4) identifying and collecting project data elements that could be aggregated and used in a statewide evaluation.

eLearning Evaluation Lens

Program evaluation is often seen as a measurement tool and nothing more. However, carefully planned and implemented program evaluation efforts actually contribute to student achievement and are closely aligned with instructional practices in individual classrooms. As we move into the age of ubiquitous computing, technology use must be transformed into a support that is *inherent* in school instructional practice. Vital to the scientifically-based research approach is the evaluation of technology programs that have been infused into districts and classrooms. We have moved beyond simple implementation and must now establish proven track records for success and the improvement of student achievement through technology.

As states consider eLearning program evaluations, it is helpful to have a starting point from which they can work and think practically about questions to be asked and issues to consider. The purpose of the eLearning Evaluation Lens is to help states understand program evaluation and assist them in their various approaches to evaluation. The framework takes the user into an early visioning stage, sets the tone for evaluation, offers points and goals on which to reflect, provides case studies and examples from which to learn and ultimately leads to readiness for state eLearning program evaluation action.

The Program Evaluation Work Group felt that it was important to create a list of guiding questions for states to consider before engaging in program evaluation and, in turn, to refer back to the eLearning Evaluation Lens:

- What is the purpose of the evaluation?
- How will results of the evaluation be used?
- Who is the audience for the evaluation?
- By what criteria will the success of the program be judged?
- What forms of evidence are acceptable given both the purpose and audience?
- What does recent research say about successful e-learning programs?

After careful consideration of the above guiding questions for conducting eLearning program evaluations, states may move forward and explore the eLearning Evaluation Lens provided below. The Lens is presented in two sections for ease of the reader. Both sections are separated into the three identified eLearning categories: 1) educator-centered; 2) student-centered; and 3) resource-centered. The first provides goals, indicators, measures, pitfalls, and models for states to review. The second section supplies users with crucial information on current state eLearning initiatives.

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
Educator-centered					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technical infrastructure supports equitable access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complies with guidelines/standards for security, legal and ethical issues ▪ Policies in place for establishing, using, and maintaining ▪ Centralized funding and management of a single, reliable network to ensure equal access ▪ Provides timely technical assistance for maintaining and using technology ▪ Configured for efficient and effective data collection for use in monitoring and analysis to support program operation and improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of items that align to infrastructure guidelines ▪ Number of items that align to security standards ▪ Number of items that align to legal standards ▪ Number of items that align to ethical standards ▪ Checklist of policies ▪ Number of problems reported on maintenance logs ▪ Response time logs ▪ User surveys ▪ Alignment chart depicting relationship of data collection, monitoring, and analysis components to needs ▪ Reports that use monitoring and analysis tools ▪ Survey of users to determine whether data outputs were accessible and useful for program evaluation ▪ Checklist of essential conditions for centralized funding and management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incompatibility of technical infrastructure to program design ▪ Lack of policies and lack of efficient process for adopting policies ▪ Insufficient consideration of data analysis ▪ Lack of risk management plan ▪ Lack of basic level of understanding of technology operations and functions for troubleshooting ▪ Lack of consideration for total cost of ownership ▪ Lack of preliminary planning and use of data for decision making ▪ Unreliability of technical infrastructure ▪ Lack of training for end-users, resulting in technologically proficient staff using the system and the rest of the staff not using the system 	

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase educator quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Process for continuous assessment of learning needs in place to guide program improvements ▪ Professional development founded on research-based adult learning theory ▪ Design of professional development follows standards and research-based principles of content, context, and process ▪ Utilizes multiple assessment measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Administration of educator needs assessment ▪ Correlation of adult learning theory aligned to professional development design ▪ Correlation of professional standards (ISTE, NSDC etc.) to research based program design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of learners includes measures such as portfolios, rubrics, pre-post surveys, reflection journals, observation, and documentation of learning time and place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of needs assessment and lack of use of needs assessment data • Insufficient use of adult learning theory and research base for program design and delivery • Leadership is non-supportive of program • Insufficient use of multiple measures for assessing learning • Ensure that content, instruction and assessment of e-learning programs comparable in rigor and breadth • Insufficient collection and use of assessment information to assure quality of instructional design and delivery • Lack of consideration for user access relative to time and place • Lack of stakeholder buy-in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Using Technology to Support the Iowa Professional Development Model (Iowa Department of Education) ▪ Environmental and Spatial Technology (EAST) Initiative (Arkansas Department of Education) ▪ Tennessee EdTech Accountability Model (TEAM) (Tennessee Department of Education) ▪ Study of Effectiveness of Two Models of Implementing Educational Technology (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction) ▪ LANCET: Looking at North Carolina Educational Technology (North Carolina Department of Education) ▪ Evaluation of the Enhancing Education Through Technology Model School Project (West Virginia Department of Education)

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective institutional leadership processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared vision through proactive leadership and administrative support Institutional policies in place to support eLearning Sustainable financing in place Reward structures such as stipends and teacher renewal credits in place Institutional and community stakeholders provide expertise and resources to support systemic change Programs provide cost effective delivery and approaches to learning needs Increased options for educator quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attitudinal survey of institutional leaders to gauge consensus Checklist to determine existence of specific institutional vision and support strategies Review existing policies relevant to eLearning Review annual budgets and sources of funding Cost benefit analysis of eLearning programming Checklist to determine existence of specific reward structures Stakeholder analysis that identifies “for,” “against,” “neutral” Review meeting minutes of involved stakeholder groups to determine specific supports provided Interviews and/or focus groups of involved stakeholder groups to determine specific supports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of shared vision among stakeholders Insufficient communication of program vision Lack of alignment of all program elements Lack of ability to obtain data due to costs, restrictions, and availability, etc. Funding instability Lack of policies and lack of an efficient process for adopting policies Failure to use stakeholder analysis information Underestimating timing of implementation events, such as equipment acquisition in relation to training Distractions that create barriers to program 	

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation incorporates communication plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work plan exists that addresses awareness, public relations, and strategies for implementation ▪ Goals clearly defined, aligned with program purpose and communicated to stakeholders ▪ Evaluation plan includes both formative and summative evaluation procedures ▪ Provides for continual growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comparison of work plan timeline to tasks accomplished • Comparison of actual budget to proposed budget • Interviews, surveys, focus groups of stakeholders to determine awareness and commitment to program value • Measures identified in evaluation plan to monitor and analyze progress toward achieving goals and outcomes • Multi-year study through formative and summative evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient resources for evaluation and continuous improvement • Prioritizing areas for in-depth evaluation • Unclear goals, policies and outcomes in accompanying work plan • Unclear communication • Insufficient stakeholder involvement • Poorly designed problem solving process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florida Virtual High School Design Program

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
Student-centered					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technology is accessible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan provides for and supports target group access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technical service data/logs ▪ Student-to-computer ratio ▪ Repair log requests ▪ 24/7 access ▪ Student/teacher surveys ▪ Logs documenting time students spend using the program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hard data and actual interview report-outs may be different ▪ No needs assessment conducted ▪ Actual connectivity for usable throughput ▪ Teacher and administrator buy-in not gained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation of Student and Parent Access Through Recycled Computers (eSPARC) (Pennsylvania Department of Education) ▪ Evaluation of the Texas Technology Immersion Pilot (eTxTIP) (Texas Education Agency)

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality Curricula and Resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Target group access to media-rich and diverse curricula and resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review alignment with standards ▪ Content reviewed by experts ▪ 501 compliance ▪ Aligned to best practices of delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not meeting curriculum standards and approval process ▪ Reliance on textbooks only ▪ Not making use of capacity of technology (i.e. electronic worksheets) ▪ Lack of appropriate time and skill to develop curriculum ▪ Under estimating the amount of technical training necessary for users to access the content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consortium for School Networking (CoSN) ▪ Environmental and Spatial Technology (EAST) Initiative (Arkansas Department of Education)

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School systems and students have options to meet diverse needs: Early test-out; high school/college credit; low-incidence courses; lack of qualified teachers; scheduling; timing; advanced placement; home-bound 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local, state and national data (i.e. highly qualified teachers, student data, NCES) Drop-out and graduation rates Number of students graduating early Retention rates Completion rates Number of students taking courses Reduced Time to Effectiveness (TTE) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certification issues across states Security issues Course availability Completion rate Screening of students Appropriate student orientation Equivalent rigor between face to face and online Financial sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational Development for Planning and Conducting Evaluations (ED PACE) (West Virginia Department of Education)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethical use of information and resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students and educators adhere to acceptable use policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of ethics violations Signed AUPs Student spot checks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation of student work Proper orientation of students Training new and re-assigned teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maryland Virtual Learning Opportunities Program MVLO (http://mdk12online.org/) The West Virginia Virtual School (http://virtuelschool.k12.wv.us/vschool/) The Arkansas Virtual High School (http://arkansashigh.k12.ar.us/avhs_main.htm)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programs sustainable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue beyond original funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding/budgeting worksheets Legislation or local board policies passed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget cuts Downsizing of original program results/design 	

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effective program implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation plan/timeline in place and followed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan with assignments, dates due, resources necessary, roles and responsibilities identified, etc. ▪ Outside audit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deadlines not met ▪ Unforeseen occurrences (need back-up plans and a program manager) ▪ Continuous monitoring is required ▪ Defined lines of authority ▪ Clear policies (should be written before the fact) ▪ Timeline and staff member(s) responsible for ongoing monitoring need to be clearly defined 	

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased student achievement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased student test scores ▪ Increased AP course enrollment ▪ Increased graduation rates ▪ Increased successful course completion rates ▪ Increased post-secondary enrollment ▪ Decreased drop-out rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Standardized test scores ▪ State and district enrollments ▪ Drop-out statistics ▪ Graduation statistics ▪ Course completion statistics ▪ Results of local, state, and national assessments ▪ Post-secondary enrollment statistics ▪ Track individual student success (case studies) ▪ Authentic assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Course content is aligned with state standards and testing system ▪ Difference between face-to-face and electronic test scores ▪ Appropriate and secure testing methodology ▪ Tracking post-secondary students after leaving high school ▪ Validity and reliability of instruments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Florida Virtual High School ▪ Massachusetts Virtual High School ▪ Michigan Virtual High School ▪ All of the Evaluating State Educational Technology Program (ESETP) federal grant programs

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	Program supports increased engagement and motivation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decreased absences ▪ Decreased discipline problems ▪ Decreased drop-out rates ▪ Increased online enrollment ▪ Increased class participation ▪ Increased course completion ▪ Increased student achievement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Absentee records ▪ Enrollment records ▪ Teacher/student interviews, logs, and referrals ▪ Attitudinal surveys ▪ Course completion data ▪ Test scores ▪ Student discipline referrals ▪ Drop-out data ▪ Authentic assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teachers and schools need a variety of strategies for motivating students (i.e. teacher phone calls, counselor intervention, monitoring of students) ▪ Surveys are always self-reported ▪ Validity and reliability of instruments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Florida Virtual High School ▪ Evaluation of Student and Parent Access Through Recycled Computers (eSPARC) (Pennsylvania Department of Education) ▪ Environmental and Spatial Technology (EAST) Initiative (Arkansas Department of Education) ▪ Evaluation of the Texas Technology Immersion Pilot (eTxTIP) (Texas Education Agency) ▪ Educational Development for Planning and Conducting Evaluations (ED PACE) (West Virginia Department of Education)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased parent and community involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parents attend orientation, PTA, and academic meetings ▪ Parents and community members advocate for eLearning initiatives ▪ Increased home/school communication ▪ Increased parent and community involvement in after school activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sign-in sheets ▪ Newspaper articles ▪ Website ▪ Newsletters ▪ Meeting agendas and minutes ▪ Special eLearning events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Family inequities become apparent ▪ Reality of information actually getting from school to home ▪ Certain parents or community members dominate conversation (hidden agendas) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Florida Virtual High School ▪ Evaluation of the Texas Technology Immersion Pilot (eTxTIP) (Texas Education Agency) ▪ Evaluation of Student and Parent Access Through Recycled Computers (eSPARC) (Pennsylvania Department of Education)

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
Resource-centered					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aligned with user educational need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Broad needs assessments show match ▪ Educational content appropriate and compelling ▪ Educational research basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews and surveys of participants ▪ Frequency and duration of use ▪ Track IP for frequency-of-use patterns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Time ▪ Uniformity ▪ Cost ▪ Quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indiana Inspire (regional focus groups, online user surveys) ▪ Seven Dimensions of Progress (Milken Foundation)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aligned with educational standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cross correlation to standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Matrix for formal review ▪ Run the Achieve database (\$50,000 per state) against meta-tagged resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-juried review ▪ Assumption of correlation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indiana provides hypertext indicators to resources ▪ California Learning Resource Network provides assessment of Electronic Learning Resources (ELRs) aligned to California content standards (www.clrn.org) ▪ Wisconsin Curriculum Resource Center (www.2.dpi.state.wi.us/crc)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ User training implemented ▪ Aligned with envisioned use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequate/significant scope ▪ Participant satisfaction ▪ Level of adoption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participant survey ▪ Concerns-based adoption model (CBAM) measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assuming awareness of resources by targeted audience ▪ Ease of use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wisconsin Badger-Link ▪ iAssessment Teacher Surveys (http://ctap2.iassessment.org)

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder expectations met or exceeded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequency and duration of use Level of stakeholder satisfaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews, focus groups, and surveys of stakeholders Web-tracking software Web page feedback forms User return rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time Access to stakeholder feedback Reliability of feedback 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient staffing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of FTEs and percentage of time spent on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staffing patterns and assignments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff time Financial Quality of staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gartner TCO Portions of enGauge
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical capacity for ubiquitous access guaranteed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple formats and variety of access pathways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hits by format type Duration of use by format type Track paths to and from resources Computer/user ratio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability of home use of resources Proxy server firewall issues Registered complaints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA TechSets help ticket and tech support system (www.techsets.org) IN online registration for bandwidth capacity check (www.IHETS.org) Network Operations Center (software/router management reports) Test-scout software

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total cost of ownership and return on investment ensured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial cost of implementation Training on hardware, software, and resource usage Need to get some benefit or input based on program goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of program participants Cost of training Cost of ongoing technical support Number of hits and completion rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources need to be periodically reviewed for appropriateness and usage Not enough use of resources Hard to document benefit or impact Cost may need to be amortized Continued update to resources Number of participants first years may be small 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gartner TCO ROI calculators such as the one from PerformTek www.Eval.org
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful management of data-gathering logistics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher and student feedback Alignment of student achievement with resource use Technical strategies up front to assure data capture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online count and duration measuring tools Student achievement scores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to gather, collate, and analyze data Define what a 'hit' is Faulty evaluation design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation specialists

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization al support for innovation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational climate and culture Use of online resources as tools for teaching and learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendance at staff development workshops Enrollment in online professional courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signatures do not guarantee support Changing political landscapes Reporting structures change Lack of communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) Diffusions of Innovation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interdisciplinary correlation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants impacted by program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of participants by group: teacher; student; parents; community members; libraries; other state agencies; other federal agencies; other schools; other school districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May not be able to know which participants affected by program immediately Ask whether cross-curriculum teams can easily see the match to their area of focus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seven Dimensions of Progress Community Connections Dimension

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long-term nurturing and viability ▪ Sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Benchmarks in place ▪ Formative assessments ▪ Alignment to standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LearnAndServe.org ▪ Risk analysis rubrics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No alignment to standards ▪ Technology evolves so rapidly that obsolescence of resources occurs quickly ▪ Sufficient staff to provide support to weed and grow the resource base 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technical assistance model for implementation and progress towards goals (www.ade.az.gov/technology/) (go to downloads for the instruments)

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data driven decision making (formative evaluation) is employed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposals based upon data analysis ▪ Funding secured and based upon data results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interactive spreadsheets ▪ State and district report cards and annual reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High quality decisions based on relevant data ▪ Assumption the feedback loop is functioning ▪ Lack of robust review of data elements and collection to assure consistency ▪ Data dictionary with training in applying the definitions ▪ Applying the correct statistical model to the data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NCREL D3 ▪ Blueprints ▪ EnGauge

eLearning Categories	Goals	Indicators	Measures	Pitfalls/Lessons Learned	Models of Successful eLearning Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thoughtful organization of juried content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased student academic engagement Increased teacher satisfaction with lesson outcomes Course-enhancement value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student surveys and observations Principal surveys, observations, and evaluations Teacher surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the standards and definition of quality Less is sometimes more Meta-tag with GEM or Dublin Core 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate Tech Georgia Learning Connections MarcoPolo Blue Ribbon Panels ACIS Instructional designers for navigation standards
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancement of educational equity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All participants have access to necessary resources for successful implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources equally distributed to districts based on identified needs and goals Surveys of current resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Politics of prioritizing resources Cost Time to analyze data Look for bias Look for appropriate readability Developmentally appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAST Section 508 http://www.w3.org/WAI/GL/#Publications

State eLearning Initiatives

State	Student-Centered Initiatives	Teacher-Centered Initiatives	Resource-Centered Initiatives
Arizona	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cox EdNet (over 250 software programs, 24/7 access to all students and teachers free of charge) 2. Graham County Consortium: Title IID distance-learning projects (provides students, teachers, and administrators on-line learning via 2-way video/audio from 7 districts in 3 counties to Eastern Arizona Community College) 3. 14 virtual learning projects through legislation providing K-12 education for students 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graham County Consortium: Title IID distance-learning projects provides students, teachers, and administrators on-line learning via 2-way video/audio from 7 districts in 3 counties to Eastern Arizona Community College. 2. An agency, ADE, partners with providers of online professional development for educators statewide. Assessment is tied to development for educators statewide and to course work. They also provide lesson plans and materials for teachers to use in all curriculum areas. They provide programs via public television, streaming video, face-to-face training, DVD's, CD's, etc. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cox EdNet (over 250 software programs, provides 24/7 access to all students and teachers free of charge) 2. An agency, ADE, partners with providers of online professional development for educators statewide. Assessment is tied to development for educators statewide and to course work. They also provide lesson plans and materials for teachers to use in all curriculum areas. They provide programs via public television, streaming video, face-to-face training, DVD's, CD's, etc.
Utah	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EHS-electronic high school (no cost, accredited with NWAAS, http://ehs.ven.org) 2. Two-way video network (offers concurrent, high school and college, credit to high school students, http://usoe.org/corr/ednet/training) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development (license renewal and endorsement) 2. Annenburg, TeacherLine, VEN (http://www.ven.org/development) 3. Master level classes: Utah State University (license renewal and endorsement) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On Track teacher portal for professional development catalog (http://usoe.iassessment.org) 2. My.ven, a teacher portal with curriculum tools (http://my.ven.org) 3. Pioneer library, teacher/student library (http://pioneer-library.org)

State	Student-Centered Initiatives	Teacher-Centered Initiatives	Resource-Centered Initiatives
Wisconsin	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wisconsin Virtual School: CESA 9-regional 2. APEX Classes: CESA 12 – AP courses 3. Reauthorization of K-20 statewide broadband network (two-way interactive distance learning, professional development, community learning) 4. University of Wisconsin: Technical College consortium for teacher training 5. School district online academies 6. Charter online schools 7. County online classes (Dane County/Madison Area) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reauthorization of K-20 statewide broadband network (two-way interactive distance learning, professional development, community learning) 2. University of Wisconsin: Technical College consortium for teacher training 3. Wisconsin Extension: Ongoing online teacher training for ESTEP grant participants 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statewide reference resources – Badgerlink all Wisconsin citizens, schools, and libraries, special and corporate libraries 2. Curriculum Resource Center as a part of state report card 3. UW Extension Lesson Plan resource
Maine	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One-to-one computing: every 7th and 8th grade student has a laptop and about 1/3 of 9th graders- wireless networks, internet, teacher training, and free databases 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ATM: Two-way video used for staff development. Real time, up to four sites can do the two-way. Unlimited broadcast without the two-way video – has T3 lines, can do shared courses for students as well, provides some one-to-one computing. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our State Library has purchased the right to a huge number of research databases to which all state residents, schools, and libraries have unlimited use.
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Louisiana Virtual Schools: available to any student in Louisiana • Algebra I online: aimed at 8th graders who don't have a certified teacher in the classroom • Geometry online: in process of being developed • Advanced placement courses online • Some districts offer compressed video (partner with another school or local university) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LEADTech: Gates-funded administrator technology training online (8 week course) 2. Universal Design for Learning: online course that emphasizes strategies for access for all student learning styles 3. Louisiana Principal Induction Program: online mentoring for all first and second year principals 4. Effective Instructional Technology I and II course: 12 week course 5. Many professional development courses offered through state and local districts 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. K-12 database and World Book: available to all students, teachers, parents 24/7, funded by state funds

State	Student-Centered Initiatives	Teacher-Centered Initiatives	Resource-Centered Initiatives
Arkansas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 27 courses taught by CIV-AR Distance Learning Center 2. AR Virtual School 3. AR School for Math, Science, and Arts Distance Learning Program 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development opportunities through the 15 education service centers 2. Distance Learning Boot Camp: Arkansas Distance Learning Center 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distance Learning Initiative: Will put CIV units in all school districts in the state. Districts that already have CIV units will receive equipment upgrades: \$15 million 2. State license for United Streaming 3. State license for Encyclopedia
Michigan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Michigan’s Freedom to Learn Program (one-to-one wireless laptop program for 6th graders, have deployed 20,000 laptops, has a strong professional development component) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gates Foundation training for school administrators 	
West Virginia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State legislation created the West Virginia School to provide courses to meet any of the needs of students to access courses. West Virginia co-developed with Florida Virtual School – middle school Spanish and Spanish I and II. Other courses are provided through multiple providers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our new E-Learning Platform was just installed – Desire 2 Learn – and, so far, we have: staff development for school development – UBD design; certification for administering medications to students; staff development for “alternate assessment” administration; and a variety of all other previous face-to-face staff development to reduce travel time and “make-up” access. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content in Grades K-6 under statewide implementation 2. Content in grades 7-12 under statewide implementation 3. Library resources in partnership with K-12, public and higher education 4. SAS in School grades 8-12 5. Marco Polo 6. Our West Virginia-developed content in the Reinventing Education grant—juried lesson plans that were evaluated by the Center for Children and Technology 7. SREB Partnership for courses/content

State	Student-Centered Initiatives	Teacher-Centered Initiatives	Resource-Centered Initiatives
Maryland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing full online courses or modules that teachers can use for tutorial or remediation (purpose to help students pass Maryland’s high school assessments, a requirement for graduation) 2. Developing student technology literacy standards, supporting materials and professional development modules 3. Leading all 24 school systems in implementing online courses for students 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing administrator technology standards 2. Developing and providing through one of our Ed Tech partnerships grants, online courses for teachers 3. Many LEAs are using their Ed Tech funding for acquiring technology integration resource teachers 4. Taking Maryland Teacher Technology Standards and working on strategies to ensure that all teachers have the knowledge and skills needed to implement 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. M@K12 Digital Library provides Social Issues Resources Series (SIRS) to all schools as a part of an Ed Tech Partnership grant. All 24 LEAs are working to develop a purchasing consortium to leverage better pricing for digital content 2. Ed Tech partnership grants to determine functionality and applications for: 1) learning management systems; and 2) curriculum management systems 3. Research project (through Ed Tech) on Cognitive Tutor Algebra for high school students
Kansas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Final stages of developing a statewide network to provide content and Internet2 services 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at and beginning to develop professional development for use/distribution on a statewide network 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kansas Education Resource Center – (www.kerc-ks.org) hosts links to lesson plans, websites, and other resources matched to state standards
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network of distance learning courses delivered over ITV • 15 online programs being delivered to students using computer/internet delivery (district-based, open to students statewide) • Title IID project focused on technology assisted instruction 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A number of Title IID projects that involve technology integration professional development for teachers, including one consortium working with e-Mints models 2. Many districts deliver online training to teachers using products such as Atomic Learning 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 3-4 data warehouse/data-driven decision-making projects underway through Title IID
Idaho	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Virtual schools, K-12 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recertification classes and assessments 2. ISIMS – Idaho Student Information Management System – to bring student management, curriculum management, IEP, and data analysis tools to all educators 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statewide research databases 2. Teacher portals 3. Statewide online assessment 4. Statewide remediation

State	Student-Centered Initiatives	Teacher-Centered Initiatives	Resource-Centered Initiatives
Texas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title II, D (TARGET Grants) 2. eCP Project (Electronic Course Pilot) 3. TIP Project (Technology Immersion Pilot) 	<p>Title II, D (TARGET Grants)</p> <p>TIP Project (Technology Immersion Pilot)</p>	
South Dakota	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Satellite Video Conferencing Courses, especially Spanish language and higher level math 2. Site-based and individual student-driven participation in web-based learning opportunities 3. Pockets of whole programs incorporated into the overall school plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Satellite video conferencing courses available through higher education private entities and local providers 2. Pockets of various web-based participation and delivery 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Education portal
North Carolina	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AP Online courses (AP grant) 2. Online Latin I, II, III 3. Large variety of core courses online through our partnership with USDLC and VHS 4. Course recovery courses through MIVS 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have a STAR schools grant featuring video and e-forums (a Best Practices in School Media Program grant with video and online courses) 2. North Carolina Information Highway program development from our Instructional services area 3. eBistro: professional development website for integrating technology into teaching and learning – currently under development as well as Gale reference resources and Grolier encyclopedias
Oregon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are a number of online schools, generally district-based, but there is one of a consortium of ESDs that has grown to cover half the state (another offers classes across the state) 		

State	Student-Centered Initiatives	Teacher-Centered Initiatives	Resource-Centered Initiatives
Alaska	1. A number of online schools, some with large enrollment (> 1,000). (In Alaska, funding follows the student and is not district based.)		
Montana	1. A small project with funding from the Governor through a University		
California		1. Gates-funded training for administrators that utilizes the link with technology through a regional educational technology module	1. California Learning Resource Network: reviews electronic learning resources for alignment with state standards and electronic learning assessment resources to inventory them for component characteristics 2. CaK12 High Speed Network: encompasses 98% of school districts and provides classroom-level access to resources on the broadband network

Work Group Members

Cynthia Bertrand	Louisiana
Frances Bradburn	North Carolina
Melanie Bradford	Arkansas
Lee Bray	Mississippi
Chris Castillo	Arizona
Jana Craig	Kansas
Debbie Fortune	Alabama
Cathy Higgins	New Hampshire
Tammy Kreuz	Texas
Dennis Kunces	Maine
Mary Mehsikomer	Minnesota
Jayne Moore	Maryland
Dwight Sinila	Michigan
James Smith	Washington
Gloria Steele	South Dakota
Donna Steffan	Wisconsin
Laura Taylor	Indiana
Barbara Thalacker	California
Kathleen Webb	Utah
Brenda Williams	West Virginia
Dawn Wilson	Idaho

Resource Specialist

SEIR*TEC
Evaluation Software Publishing
Northwest Educational Technology Consortium
University of Virginia
SEIR*TEC
BellSouth Foundation
North American Council for Online Learning

Elizabeth Byrom
Barbara Clements
Seymour Hanfling
Walt Heinecke
Nita Matzen
Kim Mulkey
Tim Stroud

Facilitator – Nancy Sullivan

Writer – Whitney Sherman