Speakers

Dr. Kelvin Bentley, former Vice President of Academic Affairs, Tarrant County Community College

Shashank Iyer, Principal, Tyton Partners
Agenda

01 Time for Class Research Findings
02 What is the CWiC Framework?
03 Courseware Implementation Guides
04 Discussion
05 Wrap-Up
Faculty and administrators face an evolving swirl of teaching and learning terms, technologies, and practices.

When everyone claims to be adaptive/personalized, how can you tell the difference?

Sign up for a free account at cwic.learnplatform.com
We have a product satisfaction problem that impacts discovery and selection

**Recommendations Drive Discovery & Selection...**

Administrators: Which of the following resources are most valuable to inform your digital learning product discovery and selection? (Choose up to three)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>% of Admin Selecting Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations - My Institution</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations - Other Institution</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences &amp; Events</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for T&amp;L</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Websites/ Demos</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Searches</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Party Research</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Blogs/ Websites</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...Yet Courseware Promoters Are Far Outnumbered by Detractors
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Administrator and Faculty Net Promoter Score*, Courseware Currently in Use

20% are promoters, while 47% are detractors

Note: A Net Promoter Score is evaluated by asking, “How likely are you to recommend this [product, service, or company] to a friend or colleague?” with 10 being “very likely” and 0 being “not at all likely.” People responding 9 or 10 are considered to be promoters of the product, those who select 7 or 8 are neutral, and respondents indicating 6 or below are considered to be detractors. The NPS is calculated by subtracting the portion of respondents that are detractors from the portion that are promoters, and it is a metric used by companies across industries as an indication of customer satisfaction.

Sources: Tyton Partners Digital Learning Primary Research 2016; Tyton Partners analysis
Issues with courseware product satisfaction
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The Courseware-in-Context (CWiC) Framework

The CWiC Guide to Courseware
The four components of the CWiC Framework drive product understanding and awareness of implementation best practices.

- **Product Taxonomy**: A set of courseware product attributes selected and organized to aid in the understanding of product functionality and to support differentiation among solutions.
- **Research Collection**: A list of published research tagged to product capabilities identified in the Product Taxonomy. Builds transparency into the learning science behind product design.
- **Course-Level Implementation Guide**: Selected course- and institution-level considerations for effective courseware implementation. Derived from the OLC Online and Blended Learning Scorecards.
- **Institution-Level Implementation Guide**: The Courseware in Context (CWiC) Framework supports postsecondary decision-makers to navigate the market of courseware solutions to find the solution that best fits their institutional goals and implement it effectively.

Sign up for a free account at cwic.learnplatform.com
# Courseware in Context Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE CASE</th>
<th>SUGGESTED USER</th>
<th>CWIC FRAMEWORK TOOL</th>
<th>CWIC FRAMEWORK COMPONENT</th>
<th>ACCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore courseware products</td>
<td>Educators, instructional designers and administrators</td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coursewareincontext.org, LearnPlatform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select or evaluate a courseware product</td>
<td>Instructional designers and tech-savvy instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>Coursewareincontext.org, LearnPlatform, EdSurge Product Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understand the learning science behind courseware</td>
<td>Educators, instructional designers and administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>Coursewareincontext.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform a course or program review</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>Coursewareincontext.org, LearnPlatform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The LearnPlatform allows users to view how vendors have self-reported on their product’s features and attributes. Users can also compare product features across two or more products.
CWiC Framework: Product Taxonomy

**FUNCTIONAL CAPABILITIES**

- **Depth of Interaction**: The presence of variety and higher-order learning skills in instruction.
- **Measurement & Structure**: The presence of academic structures and the capacity to assess learning in relation to them.
- **Adaptivity**: The adjustment of presentations of content in relation to knowledge of learners.
- **Feedback**: The deployment of reports, notifications, or visualizations to learners or educators.
- **Collaboration**: Collaboration is a requirement or opportunity for learners to engage with other people in the context of learning: peers, mentors, or educators.
- **Customization Configuration**: The ability for educators or course designers to alter learning or assessment content.
- **Scaffolding**: Support structures to help learners achieve and grow beyond their current proficiencies.
- **Learner Autonomy**: The ability for learners to impact or augment instruction based on their choices.
- **Usability**: Features of software and user-centered design that support sustained engagement.

**PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES**

- **Accessibility**
- **Browser/OS Compatibility**
- **Interoperability**
- **Privacy & Security**
- **Scalability**

**DELIVERY PLATFORM CAPABILITIES**

- **Content Management**
- **Course Administration**
- **Reporting**
What do vendors mean when they say “adaptive”?

- Adapts goals or standards for learner completion based on more inputs than a single correct response to previous item / activity: 74.9%
- Adapts presentation of content based on learner-declared goals: 27.6%
- Adapts complexity or presentation of content based on a learner pre-test: 38.6%
- Adapts complexity or presentation of content based on a learner’s affective state: 28.3%
- Adapts scope of instruction based on more inputs than a single correct response to previous item / activity: 69.0%
- Educators/ course designers can override or change parameters of adaptive protocols: 71.0%
What do vendors mean when they say “customizable”?

- Repository of additional content that can be accessed/ incorporated by educators or course designers
  - Tablestakes
  - Differentiator

- Ability to create/edit learning content and assessments
- Ability to reorder and delete learning content and assessments
- Ability to create and edit learning objectives or outcomes
- Ability to reorder and delete learning objectives or outcomes
- Repository of addl’ assessments / assessment items that can be accessed and incorporated
There is a disconnect between what vendors self-report & what institutional users report regarding product features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Institution Reported Data on Product A</th>
<th>Vendor Self-Reported Data on Product A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptivity</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customization / Configuration</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Interaction</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Autonomy</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement &amp; Structure</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browser OS Compatibility</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy &amp; Security</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalability</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Management</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Administration</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Capabilities in RED reflect those for which vendor self-reported features are higher than institution reported.
Evaluating Courseware at UCF

Background

• Instructional designers compared implementations of two college math products
• Evaluations varied moderately from the Vendors’ self evaluation
• Product evaluations took 2-hours or less for power-users (ID team and faculty)

Informing changes to CWiC

• Several minor UX changes were forwarded directly to the Lea(R)n team
• Customization attributes should be made more granular
• Provide examples and additional clarity on social-emotional factors to assist faculty who may be unfamiliar with that language

General Feedback

• Evaluations could be done by an academic or tech-focused dept.; any department that is making a decision between two products
• Faculty found the implementation guides to be useful
• Some interoperability, privacy & security, and scalability questions were not able to be answered by anyone at institution

Overall

• Use of the CWiC Framework to evaluate implementations supported differentiation between the two products
• The analysis will be useful for product selection decisions going forward, in particular for adaptive products
Systematizing Product Selection at ASU

Background
- Instructional Designers and faculty used staff input, impact analysis and the interactive CWiC Framework’s Feature Analysis
- Evaluated the impact of the use of Yellowdig on students’ performance.

Impact
- Demonstrated that the interactive CWiC Framework can be combined with other tools to measure impact of courseware on student outcomes.
- Pilot participants found that the Interactive CWiC Framework allowed for systematizing courseware evaluation

Pilot Overview
- IDs partnered with 31 instructors to complete the CWiC Framework feature analysis
- Used Yellowdig participation data and student performance metrics (i.e grades and retention) to identify relationship between Yellowdig participation and student success.

Conclusion
- Holistic product evaluation through faculty feedback collection, review of the product against the CWiC Framework, and impact analysis form a strong body of data that will inform discussions around expanded use of Yellowdig.
CWiC Framework: Implementation Guides

The Framework includes Course- and Institution-Level Implementation Guides with 10 categories and 20 indicators derived from the OLC Online and Blended Learning Scorecards.

Guides support assessment of select practices and policies in place that impact the conditions for effective courseware implementation, and are an ideal "on-ramp" for faculty and administrators completing reviews of online and blended courses using the Online Learning Consortium Scorecards.

**Course- and Institution-Level Implementation Guides**

**Course-level categories**
- Course Development / Instructional Design
- Course Structure
- Teaching and Learning
- Student Support
- Evaluation and Feedback

**Institution-level categories**
- Faculty Support
- Institutional Support
- Technology Support
- Student Support
- Evaluation and Feedback

For more information or to gain access to the full version of the quality scorecards, visit onlinelearningconsortium.org/consult/quality-scorecard. Faculty members seeking to learn more about improving their instructional practices when using courseware are invited to check out OLC’s Digital Courseware Instructional Practice Scorecard, available here onlinelearningconsortium.org/consult/olc-digital-courseware-instructional-practice.
Discussion Questions:

1. What are some challenges you are facing in this phase of courseware selection or evaluation?

2. How do you evaluate courseware and for what purpose (i.e. to expand course offerings online, to become more efficient for large scale general-ed., etc)?

3. What rubrics, scorecards, evaluation tools do you use to assess your course/institution’s readiness to implement courseware?

4. What is your biggest challenge in your current phase of digital courseware selection or evaluation?

5. What does high quality, effective courseware implementation look like?
Now What Do I Do?

• Sign up for a free account at cwic.learnplatform.com
  – Invite vendors to participate by giving the InstantRFI a try cwic.learnplatform.com

• Engage with all the components of the CWiC Framework at www.coursewareincontext.org

• Ask us about supporting your implementation of the CWiC Framework at your institution

• Interested in serving on the Executive Committee? Email us at cwic@tytonpartners.com