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# Executive Summary

This report presents the findings from an 18-month evaluation of the implementation of Edwin Teaching and Learning (ET&L) and ongoing use of Edwin Analytics. It is the last in the series of evaluation reports developed by American Institutes for Research (AIR), in collaboration with Evidence-Based Education Research and Evaluation (EBERE), for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE).

The focus of this evaluation is on the separate but related ET&L and Edwin Analytics, an instructional improvement system and a data analysis system, respectively. Edwin Analytics, formerly the Education Data Warehouse, offers data resources to districts to monitor and improve student and teacher success, including the Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS), postsecondary enrollment and outcomes, and Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) results. ET&L, a new system as of 2013, is meant to complement Edwin Analytics, providing districts, schools, and educators access to assessment and instructional tools, including item banks, online assessment and reporting capabilities, model curriculum units (MCUs), curriculum and lesson-planning tools, and vocational competency tracking tools. It relies upon the school interoperability framework (SIF), which is being implemented statewide to transfer data continuously between the State and the districts, allowing (near) real-time course, teacher, and student tracking and monitoring.

ET&L was initially funded through a Race to the Top (RTTT) grant and was first introduced to a pilot group of 34 RTTT districts starting in March 2013. Other districts were given the option to adopt it throughout the 2013–14 school year, at no cost through the end of the 2014–15 school year. Currently, all districts in the State have the option to implement ET&L at no cost. Edwin Analytics has always been available free of charge, but access to it has been limited to school and district administrators. As of fall 2013, ESE began offering districts the option to provide some Edwin Analytics access to teachers as well.

This evaluation examined districts’ and users’ experiences with both Edwin systems to address five evaluation questions (EQs):

EQ1. How are goals, timelines, and expected uses defined and communicated for each system?

EQ2. How is ET&L training delivered, and what makes it more or less successful in terms of attaining ESE’s goals for Edwin systems? How is training addressed for Edwin Analytics?

EQ3. Who uses ET&L, and how do they use it? Edwin Analytics?

EQ4. In what ways has implementation of each Edwin system been successful or not successful, and why?

EQ5. What policies and procedures should be in place to help ensure the successful and sustainable implementation of both Edwin systems and of their integrated use?

Data for the evaluation were drawn from interviews and focus groups with State, district, and school administrators, and with teachers; observations of State and district trainings; observations of educators using the systems (think-aloud observations); two rounds of user surveys (January and November 2014); usage data from both systems; and an analysis of documents offered through the ET&L resources page. We collected and analyzed these data in three phases over the course of 18 months, from July 2013 to December 2014, with an initial focus on ET&L pilot districts in summer 2013 (Phase 1), and then subsequent inclusion of more districts starting in fall 2013 as the system was rolled out across the state (Phases 2 and 3).

The majority of our data were focused on ET&L because it is a new system. Satisfaction with ET&L at this stage has been mixed. Administrators and teachers who use ET&L generally reported that they were pleased with certain aspects of the system, especially its assessment and reporting features*.* However, there were a number of barriers to the widespread use of ET&L, and adoption rates were not as robust as the State had intended. Our findings for Edwin Analytics, an older and more established system, revealed widespread satisfaction among administrators, who expressed appreciation for its capabilities, flexibility, and speed.

This summary describes these findings by research question, followed by recommendations for continued implementation of both systems.

EQ1. How are goals, timelines, and expected uses defined and communicated for each system?

The evaluation’s first question examined the State’s role in defining goals and expectations for both Edwin systems, and communicating them to districts, as well as districts’ expectations for system use.

ET&L

In a series of formal interviews, State ET&L leaders said that the State’s overarching goal for the system was to strengthen curriculum, instruction, and assessment, with a focus on closing Massachusetts’s achievement gaps. The message they wanted to communicate to districts is that ET&L is a cost-effective, integrated solution to address curriculum, assessment, and instructional needs, all in a single package that is less expensive than these components would be individually.

Our findings indicated that the State adequately communicated these goals to educators, who exhibited widespread awarenessof State expectations about ET&L. Nonetheless, few districts had similar expectations for the system. Overall, we found that most districts did not plan to use ET&L at all or were primarily focused on the system’s assessment tool. Barriers to ET&L adoption are discussed in more detail in EQ5. However, barriers related to communication and adoption of all of ET&L’s features included the following:

* **School Interoperability Framework (SIF) Operability.**Challenges with enabling SIF (either at the district level or the vendor level) prevented the system from achieving full operability. Educators were not able to administer assessments online or analyze student results as long as SIF was not enabled. As a result, the State’s expressed expectation that ET&L operate as a comprehensive system could not come to fruition as quickly as had been initially communicated to districts.
* **Compartmentalization.**The State’s communication about ET&L appeared to be compartmentalized in a single department within ESE. Educators reported they did not receive information about ET&L from other ESE departments or at other State trainings, even when pertinent (e.g., training on creating curriculum maps).
* **Cost.** The State was unable to communicate the cost of ET&L to districts until 2014 because the per-student cost of the system is dependent on the number of districts that adopt it. As discussed in EQ5, districts wanted to be able to predict future system costs, even if they needed not pay for it initially.

Edwin Analytics

The State and districts largely shared expectations for Edwin Analytics, namely to access and use student achievement data to make decisions about instruction. These shared expectations may have been a result of the State’s communication about the system (largely through the ESE website, webinars, and occasional regional meetings and trainings), but also likely due to the way in which the system functions (i.e., as a data repository) and the length of time—nine years—that it (or its predecessor, the Educational Data Warehouse) has been available to districts.

EQ2. How is ET&L training delivered, and what makes it more or less successful in terms of attaining ESE’s goals for Edwin systems? How is training addressed for Edwin Analytics?

The State provided training for both ET&L and Edwin Analytics. ET&L training was designed as a train-the-trainer (TTT). Pilot district attendees received a three-day, face-to-face TTT, but in response to district concerns about the time required for these trainings, the ET&L vendor designed and offered virtual TTTs to subsequent trainees.[[1]](#footnote-1) The virtual TTT consisted of four one-hour live webinars (also recorded and made available later), accompanied by Web-based training modules. The State offered Edwin Analytics trainings through a variety of sources, from online webinars to bimonthly conference calls to individual district trainings provided by ESE at district request. District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) were another important source of Edwin Analytics support and training (although representatives from two DSACS attended ET&L training, DSACS were not used to support ET&L). This section describes user experiences with training for both systems.

ET&L

The main topic of both the face-to-face and virtual TTTs was assessment development and reporting. This focus was appropriate on one hand, given that the primary expectation of most districts for ET&L is to use its assessment functions. On the other hand, not providing adequate training on the reporting and curriculum components undermined the State’s goal for a comprehensive data and instruction system. Findings from district administrator interviews and ET&L user surveys indicated that participants of both types of ET&L TTTs were generally satisfied with the quality of the training, but that the majority of respondents did not feel adequately prepared to train others, perhaps partially as a result of the focus on a single system component.

The purpose of the TTTs was for participants to provide trainings within their districts, but districts varied in the amount and type of ET&L training they provided to educators. Thinkgate addressed this issue to some degree by making Web-based training modules (Thinkgate University) available to all system users. ET&L also contains the Reference Center, a searchable interface with currently more than 200 reference files. In an analysis of these resources, we found that Thinkgate University and the Reference Center were appropriate for helping users understand general features of the system, but that they were likely not sufficient to train users to implement ET&L in their own educational context, or to complete complex tasks. Not unexpectedly, it appeared that training or guidance from another experienced person is important for most educators to use the system successfully.

Edwin Analytics

The majority of current Edwin Analytics users from our sample indicated awareness of system training availability, but findings suggested that many users would benefit from more training, something that will become more important as more educators gain access to the system in the coming months and years.

EQ3. Who uses ET&L, and how do they use it? Edwin Analytics?

Our evaluation examined how users accessed and used both systems. We gave particular attention to how educators used the systems to address student achievement gaps. Findings were generally sparse, but some focus-group and think-aloud participants noted that they use data (from both systems) to identify and address individual students’ academic needs or to identify achievement gaps in student subpopulations. The rest of this section discusses which aspects of both systems users access most.

ET&L

One consistent finding throughout the different phases of the evaluation is that educators primarily use the ET&L system for assessment-related purposes. This finding was unsurprising, given the focus on assessment among districts with expectations for the system and the emphasis on the assessment feature in ET&L trainings. The emphasis on assessment may have in turn been due to the fact that other features of the system were not fully functional during early stages of the implementation. Our most recent round of data collection in summer and fall 2014 yielded similar findings about assessment, although we also found that educators frequently used the related reporting tool. Most users did not use ET&L’s curricular and digital resource tools.

However, since the State introduced ET&L in March 2013, relatively few districts have adopted it. In the time frame for which we had data (July 2014–January 2015), 85 districts had active educator accounts. These 85 districts accounted for 57 percent of the 150 districts that had indicated to the State that they wanted to participate in ET&L and 85 percent of the 100 districts that were SIF-enabled as of November 2014. Usage data show that within the active districts, less than 4 percent of 22,196 account holders logged into the system per month.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Edwin Analytics

We have found very little variation in use of Edwin Analytics since the beginning of our evaluation in July 2013. Educators use Edwin Analytics primarily to access reports related to MCAS results. System usage data indicated that financial reporting, a new function in Analytics, was the least used feature. Edwin Analytics users continued primarily to be district and school administrators, although the State now allows districts to give teachers access to Edwin Analytics, and the State has created a number of reports specifically for teachers. Users indicated that they shared data from the system widely with other educators, suggesting that teachers gain information about data from administrators rather than accessing the system directly.

EQ4. In what ways has implementation of each Edwin system been successful or not successful, and why?

We primarily addressed EQ4 by examining benefits of the system for educators and barriers to system use, discussed here by system.

ET&L

Overall, evaluation participants liked ET&L’s assessment and reporting capabilities. Participants reported that the “Make it Quick” feature in the assessment tool, which allows users to create an assessment from pre-established items, offers convenience and efficiency and the “Create Your Own” feature, with which users create their own items, offers flexibility. They also noted that in the assessment creation functions, they particularly liked the item difficulty ratings and the ability to link items to the standards. In the reporting tool, helpful features included distracter analysis, the ability to examine results by standards, the ability to sort results by classroom teacher and subgroups, and availability of results immediately following the administration of assessments.

Despite the positive features of the ET&L system, educators reported challenges more prevalently than benefits. These challenges fell primarily into two categories: usability and technological issues. Usability issues were largely related to the system interface and navigation features, which users did not find intuitive to learn or use. Technological issues included lack of hardware and infrastructure to use the system as intended (e.g., insufficient computers or bandwidth to administer assessments to students online). Other challenges have served as barriers to use at the district level, including the delay in the system functionality rollout and lack of information about cost.

Edwin Analytics

Users of Edwin Analytics reported high satisfaction with the system and its capabilities. Regular Edwin Analytics users were skilled at the tasks they did regularly and found the system straightforward for those tasks. However, think-aloud observation data suggested that users may have limitations in using the system for new or unfamiliar tasks, signaling that as Edwin Analytics is made available to more teachers, it will be important to ensure good training.

EQ5. What policies and procedures should be in place to help ensure the successful and sustainable implementation of both Edwin systems and of their integrated use?

This section examines our final EQ, addressing the sustainability of the two Edwin systems. We focus here primarily on findings about districts’ and educators’ decisions to use each system; our analysis of policies and procedures to further encourage their use is presented in the subsequent Discussion and Recommendations section.

ET&L

Adoption and use of ET&L have been low, even though the system has been offered free of cost to all districts through the end of the 2014‒15 school year. The most prevalent reason given for nonadoption is that ET&L capabilities are not superior to competing systems, contrary to the State’s expectation and intention that ET&L could replace a range of other software packages. District administrators indicated that they: (1) were reluctant to switch from systems that teachers already know and feel comfortable with, (2) did not want to risk losing historical data housed in these systems, and (3) did not want to bear the costs of importing the existing data into ET&L.

System cost overall was the second biggest reason for nonadoption. In summer 2014, evaluation participants expressed concern about not knowing the ongoing cost of ET&L after RTTT funding ended. ESE was able to make ET&L cost data available to districts starting in fall 2014. To examine the potential effect of cost on sustainability, we included an item in the November 2014 ET&L administrator survey asking respondents to rate their agreement to the statement *ET&L is worth the investment of $2.50–$6.00 per pupil.* Only 19 percent of administrator respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

Edwin Analytics

For the most part, evaluation participants seemed satisfied with the data they can get from Edwin Analytics and how the system works. However, interviews with district administrators suggest that districts have not been quick to give teachers access to the system, which is now an option. One reason for this is that they must designate each user’s access type individually, a long process in large or even moderately large districts. Furthermore, three district administrators expressed concern that the system would be too complicated to expect teachers to use it.

Discussion and Recommendations

This section discusses emergent themes and implications of the evaluation findings and offers recommendations for moving forward. The discussion is organized by system.

ET&L

The most striking aspect of our findings about ET&L is the very low usage rate. User opinions about ET&L were mixed but not strongly unfavorable; many of the evaluation participants liked aspects of ET&L. Nonetheless, less than one fifth of administrators indicated in a survey that ET&L was worth the cost per student. Most district and school administrators did not appear to perceive ET&L as a viable replacement for their other assessment and instruction systems, one of the State’s goals for the system as a whole. Several themes emerged over the course of the evaluation that reveal barriers to ET&L adoption. These themes include issues with communication, challenges with training, and challenges with the system itself. These barriers were manifested at the State, district, and system or user levels.

***State-Level Barriers***

Overall, there was insufficient communication about ET&L’s capabilities, purpose, and cost. For example, communication from the ET&L vendor (e.g., during trainings) might have better emphasized the comprehensive nature of ET&L and its other features besides assessment. More importantly, however, would have been a more uniform message from ESE as a whole, with other departments emphasizing how ET&L supports other State education initiatives, including other RTTT-funded initiatives. For example, State trainings about curriculum mapping or teacher evaluation could demonstrate how ET&L can be used to accomplish district goals in these areas.

Another state-level challenge was the ongoing issues with SIF, which allows for the transfer of data between districts, the state, and ET&L. These issues in turn led to delays in districts’ abilities to use the tool with their own student data versus a demonstration or training account. Because the real-time data is a key feature of the system, not having it in place served as a barrier to adoption for districts that wanted to show teachers their own student data. These delays also may have led districts to perceive ET&L as an incomplete system.

Recommendations:

* Develop and perpetuate an ESE-wide message about ET&L and how it supports educators’ work, especially with regards to other State initiatives.
* Continue to provide a variety of opportunities for educators to learn about the system.

***District-Level Barriers***

At the district level, training proved to be a challenge. The ET&L vendor employed a TTT model, which can be an effective method for reaching a large number of districts systematically, and the State showed good responsiveness to districts’ complaint about the time commitment of the TTTs, redesigning them completely as virtual trainings. A benefit of the virtual training plan was the use of Thinkgate University, which serves as an important resource for all ET&L users and ensures that all users have access to a systematic, although basic, level of training.

However, Thinkgate University could not replace job-embedded training, and training did not occur on a large scale within districts, likely for several reasons. First, although the TTTs discussed district ET&L implementation and provided resources for doing so, they did not sufficiently address rollout planning, so districts that did not have an implementation plan before they participated in the TTTs did not have opportunities or supports for building one. Second, because the TTTs heavily emphasized the assessment component of ET&L, TTT participants generally did not feel prepared to provide ET&L training on the entire system in their districts. Finally, the delays in operability probably reduced the likelihood of district retrainings. Many pilot districts wanted to wait until the system was fully functional before conducting trainings, but by the time this occurred, their original ET&L points of contact had taken other positions, creating a gap in district ET&L knowledge.

Recommendations:

* Expand the TTT to include more comprehensive information about all of the ET&L features, as well as information to support district implementation plans.
* Update the list of district ET&L contacts, and verify that they still hold positions within their districts that allow them to advocate for and provide training for ET&L. For districts with gaps, consider providing another round of TTTs.
* Identify and support ET&L “champions” in districts and schools—those educators who make good use of the system. Provide opportunities for them to share their ideas and practices. (ESE has begun this process through educator panels at Roadshows; the recommendation is to continue and expand this practice.)

***User-Level Barriers***

The ET&L system itself has posed barriers to users, which may have led districts to hesitate to introduce it to their teachers. Focus-group and think-aloud observation participants described ET&L as not sufficiently intuitive to use without training and practice, a process that required a relatively substantial time commitment. Most functions within ET&L are complex, with many steps. (The exception to this is the “Make it Quick” assessment, a popular feature among users.) Help resources about specific issues can be hard to find within the system. Combined with technical issues within districts (e.g., lack of appropriate hardware, bandwidth issues), users can easily become frustrated with ET&L.

Recommendations:

* Encourage Thinkgate to address the system issues outlined in Table 15 in the full report. Communicate with districts about the changes, and provide widespread information—for example, as an FAQ document—about any issues that are outside of state control (e.g., district-controlled SIF issues).
* Provide feedback to Thinkgate and encourage them to update the ET&L user interface to be more intuitive, with larger, easier-to-interpret icons.
* Provide feedback to Thinkgate to update the search function in the ET&L Reference Center to search within documents. Add tables of contents to Reference Center documents to assist users with finding information about specific tasks.

Edwin Analytics

Analytics users were largely satisfied with the system as it is. ESE has provided ongoing updates, with new data and reports, and most users agreed that the system is much improved since it was the Education Data Warehouse. Although users may experience difficulty accessing new reports and data, most were comfortable retrieving the data they needed. At this point, most users are administrators, despite the fact that the State provides districts the option to provide access to teachers.

Our only recommendation for Edwin Analytics is to consider developing a more systematic training plan as the system is offered to an increasing number of users throughout the state. New users, especially those who do not usually serve a data analysis role in their district, may have difficulty making full use of the system without assistance. Districts may be more comfortable providing access to teachers if there are additional opportunities for training.

# Introduction

This report is the last of a series of evaluation reports developed by American Institutes for Research (AIR), in collaboration with Evidence-Based Education Research and Evaluation (EBERE), for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) on the implementation of Edwin Teaching and Learning (ET&L) and ongoing use of Edwin Analytics. These two online systems, an instructional improvement system and a data analysis system, respectively, provide educators access to formative and summative assessment data and instructional resources. The systems are intended to support data-driven instruction, providing educators with real-time data to understand student needs and monitor progress, and with instructional resources designed to address those needs.

Edwin Analytics, formerly the Education Data Warehouse, an online resource first developed in 2006, offers data resources to district and school administrators to monitor and improve student and teacher success, including the Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS), postsecondary enrollment and outcomes, and Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) results. As of fall 2013, ESE began broadening access to other educators, offering districts the option to provide teachers access to a limited number of classroom-level reports. Edwin Analytics is and will continue to be available to districts free of charge.

ET&L, a new system as of 2013, is meant to complement Edwin Analytics, providing districts, schools, and educators access to assessment and instructional tools, including item banks from which users can draw for “Make it Quick” assessment creation,[[3]](#footnote-3) “Create Your Own” item and assessment creation capabilities, online assessment administration and reporting capabilities, model curriculum units (MCUs), curriculum and lesson-planning tools, and vocational competency tracking tools. ET&L relies upon the school interoperability framework (SIF), a separate system being implemented statewide to transfer data continuously between the State and the districts, allowing (near) real-time course, teacher, and student tracking and monitoring. ET&L was first introduced to a pilot group of 34 Race to the Top (RTTT) districts in March 2013, and other districts were given the option to adopt it throughout the 2013–14 school year, at no cost through the end of the 2014–15 school year. Currently, all districts in the State have the option to implement ET&L.

[See Figure 1 and Figure 2 at the end of this section for more details about each system.]

This evaluation examined district, school, and educator experiences with both systems. Our findings revealed widespread satisfaction with Edwin Analytics among administrators, who have expressed appreciation for its capabilities, flexibility, and speed, and have described it as an improvement over its predecessor, the Education Data Warehouse. Satisfaction with ET&L, a newer system with a different but complementary array of features, has been mixed. Administrators and teachers who used ET&L reported that they are pleased with certain aspects of the system, especially its assessment and reporting features*.* However, there have been a number of barriers to the widespread use of ET&L, and adoption rates have not been as robust as the State had intended. These barriers have arisenat the state, district, and user levels, as follows:

* State-level barriers to ET&L adoption
  + Lack of communication about ET&L’s capabilities, purpose, and cost
  + Ongoing issues with SIF, which allows for the transfer of data between districts and ET&L
  + A delayed rollout, leading districts to consider the system incomplete
* District-level barriers to ET&L adoption
  + Lack of cohesive training plans and vision for use
  + Primary trainers and advocates within districts leaving
* User-level barriers to ET&L adoption
  + System not sufficiently intuitive
  + Technology issues

Some of these barriers were precipitated by time constraints of the RTTT grant and other contextual factors in Massachusetts. Other barriers, however, can be addressed directly. These factors are explored in more depth throughout this report, which examines districts’ and users’ experiences with both systems to address five evaluation questions:

1. How are Edwin’s goals, timelines, and expected uses defined and communicated for each system?
2. How is ET&L training delivered, and what makes it more or less successful in terms of attaining ESE’s goals for Edwin systems? How is training addressed for Edwin Analytics?
3. Who uses ET&L, and how do they use it? Edwin Analytics?
4. In what ways has implementation of each Edwin system been successful or not successful, and why?
5. What policies and procedures should be in place to help ensure the successful and sustainable implementation of both Edwin systems and of their integrated use?

Data for the evaluation, described in more detail in the next section, were drawn from interviews and focus groups with state, district, and school administrators, and with teachers; observations of state and district trainings; observations of educators using the systems; user surveys; system usage data; and an analysis of documents offered through the ET&L resources page. We collected and analyzed these data in three phases over the course of 18 months, from July 2013 to December 2014, with an initial focus on ET&L pilot districts (Phase 1), and inclusion of more districts starting in fall 2013 as the system was rolled out across the state (Phases 2 and 3). Phases 1 and 2 findings were detailed in four interim reports (see [Appendix A](#_Appendix_A._Edwin) for a description of each). Findings from earlier reports are incorporated into this final report, which also examines new data from the third phase of data collection. (The former were presented in condensed format, without as much detail as the newer findings.)

This report is organized as follows. The Methods section discusses our data collection and analysis methods and limitations. We then report our findings by evaluation question, presenting findings for each system (ET&L and Edwin Analytics) separately when appropriate. The final section discusses the implications of our findings, with reference to the key facilitators and barriers to widespread adoption and use of both systems, and provides recommendations for ongoing implementation. A set of appendices provides further details about the evaluation.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 1. Description of Edwin Teaching and Learning  ET&L, a new system as of spring 2013, is designed to provide educators with instructional support by providing access to tools to create standards-based curriculum maps, curriculum units, and lesson plans; access to digital materials and resources; the ability to create, administer, and analyze interim and formative assessments; and the ability to track and report student progress. It is designed as an interactive classroom-based tool; educators can access models, resources, and data supplied by the State or district, but educators also can upload their own resources and student data from formative assessments they create. ET&L allows teachers to share and modify one another’s resources, and it allows schools and districts to create and share curriculum maps, lesson plans, instruction tools, and performance assessments. ESE’s schematic of ET&L’s three components, along with Edwin Analytics, with which it will eventually share a platform, is presented below.  ET&L, a new system as of spring 2013, is designed to provide educators with instructional support by providing access to tools to create standards-based curriculum maps, curriculum units, and lesson plans; access to digital materials and resources; the ability to create, administer, and analyze interim and formative assessments; and the ability to track and report student progress. It is designed as an interactive classroom-based tool; educators can access models, resources, and data supplied by the State or district, but educators also can upload their own resources and student data from formative assessments they create. ET&L allows teachers to share and modify one another’s resources, and it allows schools and districts to create and share curriculum maps, lesson plans, instruction tools, and performance assessments. ESE’s schematic of ET&L’s three components, along with Edwin Analytics, with which it will eventually share a platform, is presented in this image.  *Source:* http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/  ET&L incorporates near real-time student, teacher, and course data. Incorporation of real-time data is dependent on district implementation of SIF, which allows for event-driven transfer of data from districts to the State. SIF is being operationalized independently from the ET&L rollout, but all districts that are adopting ET&L also have elected to participate in SIF as part of their RTTT applications. |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 2. Description of Edwin Analytics  Edwin Analytics offers several data resources to educators to monitor student achievement. Data are accessed via reports, grouped into the following categories:   * **Achievement Analysis** Reports in this category provide information about district-, school-, and student-level performance on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) annual tests, along with other achievement tests. Data can be disaggregated by student demographic characteristics such as gender, English language learner (ELL) status, low-income status, race/ethnicity, and special education status. * **Item Analysis** Reports in this category provide more detailed information about student performance on the MCAS and allow users to view results from specific test items and item categories. Disaggregation by demographics also is possible. * **Student Growth Analysis** Reports in this category provide information about student performance on the MCAS over time by subgroup. * **Curriculum Analysis** Reports in this category provide district- and school-level curriculum information that allows users to identify relative strengths and weaknesses of their own curricula. * **Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS)** Reports in this category identify student risk levels and describe each risk indicator. * **Postsecondary Analysis** These reports detail postsecondary enrollment, achievement, and other related outcomes for Massachusetts public school graduates who enrolled in a public or private postsecondary institution. * **Classroom Analysis** Reports in this category display classroom-level information such as enrollment, number of test takers, courses, and teachers. These reports also provide students’ MCAS data for a selected school year. * **Enrollment Indicators** Enrollment indicator reports provide information about district-, school-, and student-level enrollment and related information such as attendance and absence rates. These data can be disaggregated by student subgroups. * **Staffing Indicators** Reports in this category provide staff full-time equivalency data disaggregated into subgroups.   Data are primarily accessed through a menu-driven interface; users enter specific information, such as district, school, and student subgroup, and receive data as described in the preceding list. The level of data available to each user depends on that person’s security role, a classification assigned by the district directory administrator. |

# Methods

As noted in the Introduction, data for this evaluation were collected from a variety of sources in three phases over 18 months from July 2013 to December 2014. Data and collection methods for Phases 1 and 2 are summarized here and in [Appendix A](#_Appendix_A._Edwin) in brief; additional details about Phase 1 data collection can be found in *Edwin Evaluation Phase 1 Report* (November 2013), and additional details about Phase 2 data collection can be found in *Edwin Evaluation Phase 2 Report* (January 2014) and *Technical Data Collection Report 3* (August 2014). The final phase of data collection, described in detail in this section, included interviews with 22 district administrators, a survey of users of both systems, an analysis of documents available in the ET&L Reference Center, an analysis of usage data from both systems, and site visits to five districts. During site visits, we conducted focus groups with school administrators, coaches, and teachers, and observations of educators using both systems.

## Phase 1 Data Collection and Analysis

The first round of data collection occurred in July–August 2013, during the initial rollout of ET&L to 34 pilot districts in the state. Data collection activities for Phase 1 included semi-structured phone interviews with five State ET&L and Analytics leaders and three lead trainers, and with administrators in 13 of the 34 ET&L pilot districts. We also examined Edwin Analytics usage data for 2,831 unique users in 383 districts, consisting of reports generated in the system in June–August 2013, disaggregated by month.

Interview data primarily addressed state and district leaders’ goals and expectations for ET&L, plans for wider rollout and implementation, approaches to training for both systems, and trainer and trainee perspectives on how system trainings equip districts to prepare educators to use the Edwin systems. These interviews also served to provide the evaluation team with a deeper understanding of the two systems. Edwin Analytics usage data provided initial insight about statewide usage of the system.

## Phase 2 Data Collection and Analysis

Phase 2 data collection occurred between September 2013 and February 2014 and focused on Edwin systems user experiences, as well as the wider rollout of ET&L to districts across the state. We used Phase 2 data to produce two reports (*Edwin Evaluation Phase 2 Report* [January 2014] and *Technical Data Collection Report 3* [August 2014]). Phase 2 data collection included the following activities, presented here by the months in which they occurred.

### September–October 2013

* Observations of district ET&L trainings, using a researcher-designed protocol (see [Appendix B](#_Appendix_B._District))
* Analysis of Edwin Analytics usage in June–September 2013, disaggregated by week

### November–December 2013

* Observations of ET&L virtual train-the-trainer (TTT) courses offered to two cohorts of administrators from 10 districts, using a researcher-designed protocol (see [Appendix C](#_Appendix_C._Training))
* A survey of 23 ET&L TTT participants (The total number of participants could not be determined.)
* Analysis of nine of the 15 Thinkgate University Web-based ET&L tutorial modules for administrators and six of the 15 modules for teachers

### January–February 2014

* A survey of pilot district educators with administrator-level ET&L access (district or school administrators): 52 were invited to participate, and 29 (55.8 percent) completed the survey.
* A survey of pilot district educators with teacher-level ET&L access: 200 randomly sampled teachers were invited to participate, and 121 (60.5 percent) completed the survey.
* A survey of Edwin Analytics users: 400 randomly sampled educators with access to Edwin Analytics were invited to participate, and 159 (39.8 percent) completed the survey.

Phase 2 data provided additional information about the experiences of educators in the ET&L pilot districts, as well as about the training that occurred as the system was rolled out to additional districts statewide. Edwin Analytics usage data continued to provide information about how users interact with the system and the most common types of information retrieved from it.

## Phase 3 Data Collection and Analysis

The final stage of data collection during summer and fall 2014 focused on statewide implementation of ET&L and use of Edwin Analytics. Interviews with additional district administrators, system user surveys, and system usage data provided a broad picture of the rollout of ET&L and Edwin Analytics use. Site visits to districts with relatively high levels of ET&L use provided in-depth information about educators’ experiences with the systems. In addition, we conducted a review of guidance documents within the ET&L Reference Center. These data form the basis for the majority of the findings in this report and in *Technical Data Collection Report 4* (October 2014), contextualized by findings in previous research phases. Each activity in Phase 3 data collection is described in the following sections.

District Administrator Interviews

We conducted phone interviews with 22 district administrators in July–October 2014, with the majority occurring in August and September. Interviewees included district administrators from two districts that had communicated to ESE officially that they would not implement ET&L. The other interviewees were sampled randomly from a list provided by ESE of contacts from the 70 districts that had received the ET&L TTT. Of these, our sample included 19 districts that had communicated to ESE in June 2014 that they would implement ET&L during the 2014–15 school year. We stratified our sample to include a nearly even number of large, medium, and small districts, as determined by student populations in the top, middle, and lowest state enrollment tertiles.

All district administrator interviews were conducted by phone using a semi-structured interview protocol. For districts that had communicated that they would adopt ET&L, the protocol was similar to the one used in Phase 1 of the evaluation, and covered topics related to goals and expectations for Edwin systems use, training experiences, actual system usage, and ways in which each system has shown or not shown success in the district. For nonadopting districts, the protocol was modified to examine each of these topics for Edwin Analytics, but for ET&L we examined only the district’s decision not to adopt the system. In the course of our interviews, we discovered that 13 of the districts that had communicated to ESE that they would adopt ET&L were not actually planning to do so; the nonadoption protocol was used with these districts as well. See [Appendix D](#_Appendix_D._District) for both protocols.

Surveys

To collect data from Edwin users, we administered three surveys: (1) ET&L Teacher Survey, (2) ET&L Administrator Survey, and (3) Edwin Analytics Survey. Surveys were modified slightly from the surveys administered during Phase 2 of the evaluation to update terminology and address new functions that were added to the systems in 2014. [Appendix E](#_Appendix_E._ET&L) provides the surveys, and [Appendix F](#_Appendix_F._ET&L) provides response frequency tables for each.

Survey Sample and Administration

The ET&L survey samples were drawn from the pool of educators who had been trained on the system. For the ET&L Teacher Survey, we randomly sampled 400 teachers from 32 districts that provided contact information for teachers who had received ET&L training. Notably, 31 districts shared contact information for 263 trainees, and one district provided information for 479 trainees. Our final sample included 248 teachers from the districts with fewer trainees and a random sample of 152 teachers from the district with many trainees.[[4]](#footnote-4) Thirty-four districts also provided information for 133 administrators (i.e., district- or school-level staff with administrator access to the system) who had received training. Our final sample consisted of 131 administrators.[[5]](#footnote-5) Response rates are discussed in the next section.

The Edwin Analytics survey sample was drawn from the pool of 4,841 educators who had logged into Edwin Analytics at least once since the beginning of the year. We selected a random sample of 396 users. The sample was stratified by districts’ accountability level and districts’ percentage of ELL students because it was expected that these contextual factors might influence Analytics users’ goals and experiences.

The surveys were administered online between November 4, 2014, and December 1, 2014. We   
e-mailed individual survey invitations and instructions to sampled participants. The team also sent electronic reminders to nonrespondents six, nine, 14, and 16 days after the initial invitation was sent. Per ESE’s request, the Edwin Analytics survey was reopened between December 8, 2014, and December 12, 2014, to increase the number of respondents.

Response Rates

Response rates were similar across surveys. The highest response rate was for the ET&L Administrator Survey, followed by the ET&L Teacher Survey and the Analytics Survey (see ). Nonrespondents were defined as individuals who received the survey and opted out, or completed fewer than three questions. Individuals who did not receive the survey were not considered nonrespondents and were removed from the sample.

Table 1. Overall Response Rates

|  | ***N* Invited** | ***N* Completed** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ET&L Administrator Survey | 131 | 53 | 40.4% |
| ET&L Teacher Survey | 400 | 158 | 39.5% |
| Edwin Analytics Survey | 396 | 151 | 38.1% |

*Note:* Administrator survey respondents included any users with administrator-level access to ET&L. We did not distinguish among district- and school-level administrators, or among users at the same school.

We examined whether the low response rates were driven by nonresponse bias, comparing district-level demographic data to assess whether the average respondent differed from the average nonrespondent in meaningful ways.

Table 2 displays the observed differences in district characteristics between respondents and nonrespondents. It appears that respondents to the ET&L Administrator Survey represented more disadvantaged districts than did nonrespondents. We observed that respondents’ districts were 14.2 percentage points more likely to be “low performing” (classified as Level 3, 4, or 5); however, evaluators postulated that this difference would not compromise survey results because low-performing districts were potentially more likely to need and use the Edwin systems than their high-performing peers. In contrast, respondents to the ET&L Teacher Survey appeared to represent somewhat more advantaged districts. In addition, teacher survey respondents’ districts were slightly less likely to be classified as low performing (a 4.7 percentage point difference) and served fewer low-income students than nonrespondents’ districts (an 8.4 percentage point difference). Finally, for the Edwin Analytics Survey, we found only minor differences between respondents and nonrespondents.

Table 2. Characteristics of Survey Respondents and Nonrespondents

| **Characteristic** | **Respondents** | **Nonrespondents** | **Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *ET&L Administrator* | | | |
| District percentage ELL | 8.9% | 5.2% | 3.7% |
| District percentage disability | 19.1% | 22.3% | −3.2% |
| District percentage low income | 46.3% | 38.6% | 7.7% |
| District Level 3–5 | 32.1% | 17.9% | 14.2% |
| *ET&L Teacher* | | | |
| District percentage ELL | 9.6% | 10.7% | −1.1% |
| District percentage disability | 16.3% | 15.5% | 0.8% |
| District percentage low income | 55.6% | 64.0% | −8.4% |
| District Level 3–5 | 58.9% | 63.6% | −4.7% |
| *Edwin Analytics* | | | |
| District percentage ELL | 6.1% | 6.2% | −0.1% |
| District percentage disability | 17.6% | 16.9% | 0.7% |
| District percentage low income | 37.2% | 36.9% | 0.3% |
| District Level 3–5 | 39.7% | 42.4% | −2.7% |

*Note 1*: A positive difference indicates that the percentage of respondents with an observed characteristic is greater than the percentage of nonrespondents with the same characteristic. A negative difference indicates the opposite: The percentage of nonrespondents is greater than the percentage of respondents.

*Note 2:* Educators from Level-3, Level-4, and Level-5 districts were overrepresented in the teacher sample because 152 of the 400 sampled (38 percent) were from a single low-performing district.

Finally, Edwin Analytics survey respondents tended to be more active users than nonrespondents. Respondents had viewed an average of 344 reports, whereas nonrespondents had viewed an average of 221 reports.

System Usage Data

System usage data were examined for both systems. For Edwin Analytics, ESE provided raw data files that indicated, for every Edwin Analytics report generated by at least one user in a given week, the number of times the report was generated by that user over the period of June 2013–December 2014 (see Figure 2 for a description of Edwin Analytics report categories). Users marked as “ESE/Other” or “ESE,” users who had missing district information, and users who exclusively generated reports not intended for data-driven decision making[[6]](#footnote-6) were excluded from all analyses, and the final data set included data from 7,393 unique users who generated a total of 2,295,939 reports and who were affiliated with 440 unique districts. We used these data to calculate system usage measures; further information about Edwin Analytics usage variables and analysis is provided in *Technical Data Collection Report 4* (October 2014).

For ET&L, ESE provided usage data from 85 unique districts and 881 unique schools. The data files covered the period July 2014 to January 2015. These data files indicated, for each month and each participating district/school, information including the total number of logins to ET&L, the total number of unique users who logged in, the number of tests created and administered online or on paper, the number of users who created instruction materials, and the number of instruction materials that were created. The following paragraphs explain these measures and our analysis in more detail:

* **Total number of logins:** a count of the total number of logins into ET&L. This measure identifies the number of times a user accessed the system for any reason and helps identify intensity of use. We report on this measure monthly and overall.
* **Number of unique users logging in:** the number of individuals with ET&L accounts who logged in in a given month. The number of unique users who logged in indicates how widespread ET&L access was across all account holders. We do not aggregate this measure across months because the data were provided in aggregate and we cannot be sure that the number of unique users who accessed ET&L in one month is a different set of unique users who logged in the next month.
* **Number of users who used ET&L to create instructional materials:** the number of ET&L users who used the system to create instructional materials, such as curriculum plans, unit plans, lesson plans, and other instructional materials, in a given month. As above, we do not aggregate this measure across months.
* **Number of classroom and district tests created and administered:** a count of the total number of tests that were created or administered in ET&L. These numbers reveal how intensively ET&L was being utilized beyond simple logins. We report on this measure monthly and overall.
* **Number of students who took a classroom or district test:** a count of the total number of students who took a test that was administered via ET&L. These numbers indicate how many students were directly impacted by use of ET&L test creation. We report on this measure monthly and overall and by administration method (paper based or online).
* **Number of instructional materials created:** a count of the number of instructional materials that users created within ET&L or uploaded to ET&L.

We also used a school’s name, along with publically available Common Core data and district and school websites, to determine the grade levels served by each school. Although this effort was fairly comprehensive, there were some schools that we were not able to identify, most of which were outplacement and other special school types. However, none of these schools had any ET&L usage at all, so those that we could not identify do not appear in figures or tables where we disaggregate usage by school level.

ET&L Reference Center Review

ET&L includes a Reference Center as part of its Help menu, accessed from the main system page. The Reference Center includes 238 Reference Guides and a feature to allow users to sort references by intended user (administrator or teacher), reference category (e.g., notes, tips, and tricks), reference type (e.g., training, webinar), ET&L components (e.g., assessment, curriculum), reference format (e.g., Word document, video), and date added. It also includes a text search feature.

We rated how easy or difficult it is to locate and to use Reference Center materials for 18 tasks related to assessment creation (e.g., create and save assessment items), assessment administration and reporting (e.g., administer assessments online, run an assessment results report), and curriculum (e.g., use model curriculum units from ESE). A full list of these tasks is provided in the Findings section for evaluation question (EQ) 2. Two reviewers[[7]](#footnote-7) independently rated each of the 18 tasks using two usability dimensions: availability of task guidance and clarity of guidance. The reviewers were given brief a priori criteria for these ratings based on previous studies of online guidance documents. However, the development of rating criteria proved to be an iterative process. Initially, the availability of guidance was rated using the following categories and criteria:

* **Available/easy to locate.** Documentation for the task was easily found either through menus or search function. Either there was a document that specifically addressed the task, or the document was well organized so that the guidance could be easily found.
* **Available/hard to locate.** Documentation for the task was difficult to find, either because it was not named clearly or because the information was “buried” within a large document.
* **Unavailable**

The clarity of guidance was initially rated using the following categories and criteria:

* **Clear.** The documentation provided clear and unambiguous directions that allowed the rater to accomplish the task.
* **Unclear.** The documentation provided confusing or ambiguous guidance, so that the rater could not accomplish the task without difficulty or at all.
* **Not applicable.** No guidance was available.

The reviewers briefly annotated their ratings to facilitate discussion about discrepancies. Using these criteria, the raters agreed on 13 of 18 ratings of availability of guidance, and on 10 of 18 ratings of clarity of instructions. The two reviewers conferred on their ratings and articulated a more explicit set of criteria for each rating category. Based on this set of criteria, they determined that they agreed on all task ratings for both dimensions. The revised criteria for availability of guidance are delineated in Table 3, and the revised criteria for the clarity of guidance provided by the Reference Guide are shown in Table 4. The following issues did not factor into reviewer ratings:

* Number of steps needed to complete a task: The steps required to complete a task were determined to be a function of the system and thus do not reflect the clarity of the reference documents.
* System errors: Issues with the system timing out or the lack of availability of resources or data in the demonstration site were determined not to be indicative of the clarity of the reference documents.

Table 3. Criteria for Availability of Guidance Within Reference Document

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Criteria** |
| Available/ easy to locate | Descriptive titles or headers used in reference document:   * The document title or introduction describes the task so that reviewers can quickly determine whether reference document will provide necessary guidance. * A section header related to the task is present within the document. |
| Available/ hard to locate | Guidance is located within document, but a section header does not reflect the task. |
| N/A | The reviewer was unable to identify a document that addressed the specific task. |

Table 4. Criteria for Rating Clarity of Instructions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Criteria** |
| Clear | * Steps are in correct sequence. * Sufficient detail is provided to complete steps. * Where provided, visuals in reference document mirror what appeared on screen for each step. |
| Unclear | * Steps are not in the correct order. * Detail provided is not sufficient to complete steps. * Where provided, visuals in reference document do not match what appeared on screen for each step. |
| N/A | The reviewer was unable to determine rating because no document was identified to address the specific task. |

### Site Visits

During October–November 2014, we completed district site visits to gain a more in-depth understanding of educators’ experience with ET&L and, when possible, with Edwin Analytics. We contacted 35 districts that had received ET&L TTT and that had indicated to ESE that they planned to adopt the system in the 2014–2015 school year. (We excluded those that we knew from other data collection activities had not adopted the system.) Of these, five indicated that district educators were using ET&L and agreed to the data collection activities. During each site visit, we conducted focus groups with teachers and administrators who use ET&L and conducted one-on-one think-aloud observations. This section describes these activities.

Focus Groups

We conducted focus groups with educators representing ET&L users in each district. In scheduling site visits, we asked each district point of contact to arrange focus groups with teachers in different grade spans (elementary, middle, and high school), school- and district-level administrators, and data or academic coaches, depending on who was using ET&L in the district. In total, we conducted three administrator focus groups, three coach focus groups, and nine teacher focus groups (one principal and four academic coaches joined the teacher focus groups). Details about participants are provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Participants in ET&L Focus Groups

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Group** | **Number of  Focus Groups** | **Total Number of Participants** | **Participant Roles** |
| District-level administrators | 2 | 3 | superintendent, curriculum coordinator |
| School-level administrators | 1 | 2 | principal, assistant principal |
| Coaches | 3 | 14 | English language arts (ELA) coach, literacy coach, math coach |
| Teachers | 9 | 42 | principal, academic coach, teachers at elementary, middle, and high schools (ELA, math, science, social studies) |

Focus groups were semistructured and conducted in person using protocols provided in [Appendix G](#_Appendix_G._Focus). Focus groups covered topics related to goals and expectations for Edwin systems use, training experiences, actual system usage, and successes and challenges with using the Edwin systems.

Think-Aloud Observations

In each site-visit district, we conducted observations of educators while they were using the Edwin systems in order to gain deeper knowledge of how teachers use the systems, what they use in the systems and why, and challenges they face while using the systems. During site visits, we asked if focus-group participants would be willing to show us more about the system in a one-on-one observation. Twenty-seven educators, including 14 teachers, 11 coaches, and two school-level administrators, agreed to participate.

We used a semistructured protocol that first gave participants an opportunity to navigate each system as they typically do. The second part presented participants with targeted probes directing them to work with different features of the Edwin Analytics and ET&L systems. During both parts, we asked participants to think aloud, or react verbally to what they were experiencing in the systems. The think-aloud observation protocol is provided in [Appendix H](#_Appendix_H._Think-Aloud). Of the 28 think-aloud observation participants, 18 were not familiar with Edwin Analytics and were therefore not presented with probes about that system.

### Limitations

This evaluation’s primary limitation has been the low number of districts implementing ET&L. The low adoption rate also has been a finding, and we examined it in more detail through some of our data sources, especially administrator interviews. However, some of our data collection methods, including training observations, usage data analysis, and site visits, were aimed at examining how educators use and interact with the system, and with few districts adopting, we were unable to find the volume of participants we had hoped for. On the other hand, our participant sample makes up a larger proportion of ET&L users than originally anticipated, resulting in likely more representative results.

Another chief limitation of the study pertains to respondents to the three November 2014 Edwin user surveys. For the ET&L user surveys, we were unable to determine how many teachers in the State had received ET&L training within their districts, so it was not possible to determine whether the respondents were a representative sample of users. An additional limitation to the surveys was the low response rates, with an average 39 percent response rate across all three. A potential reason for the low response rates is that many districts in Massachusetts were participating in competing data collection activities as the federal RTTT program drew to a close. However, we do not have means to determine if this was indeed the case.

# Findings by Evaluation Question

This section presents findings for each system (ET&L and Edwin Analytics) by evaluation question. Overarching themes are identified and discussed in the Discussion and Recommendations section.

## EQ1. How are Edwin’s goals, timelines, and expected uses defined and communicated for each system?

The evaluation’s first question examines the State’s role in defining goals and expectations for both Edwin systems and communicating them to districts, as well as districts’ expectations for educators’ use. Overall, we found that districts’ expectations for ET&L have expanded over the course of the rollout, though their expectations have not kept up with system feature availability. Initially, most district expectations focused on the system’s assessment feature, the only fully functional feature. Although all system features are now fully operable, districts continue to primarily focus on assessment, with a subset also expressing plans to use the reporting features and the curriculum tool. However, most districts do not plan to use ET&L at all, a finding related in part to challenges with communication. (This finding and other barriers to adoption are described in more detail under EQ5.) The State and districts largely share expectations for Edwin Analytics, namely to access and use student achievement data to make decisions about instruction.

### Goals and Expectations for ET&L

During the first phase of the evaluation, we examined both the State’s and pilot districts’ goals and expectations for the rollout and use of ET&L. In a series of formal interviews, State ET&L leaders said that the State’s overarching goal for the system was to strengthen curriculum, instruction, and assessment, with a focus on closing Massachusetts’s achievement gaps. State leaders’ expectations were focused on how the system would operate; the State purposely did not form or communicate expectations for how districts would use the system, as it was and remains optional. State leaders expected ET&L to operate as a comprehensive system, giving districts a single platform from which to develop and administer assessments (assessment tool); track and evaluate student progress (reporting tool); and develop, edit, and distribute curricular and instructional materials (curriculum tool). State ET&L leaders said that they expected ET&L to replace a range of other less cost-effective software packages that districts were using.

However, during early stages of the implementation, not all features were fully functional. The State sought to offer ET&L to some districts as early as possible, so pilot districts were initially offered an “out-of-the-box” version while the vendor completed work on the system’s capabilities. As a result, districts were not able to upload their own students’ data (a key component of the reporting tool), nor did all of the functions operate fully, including the curriculum tool. During the initial implementation period, interviews with pilot district administrators, observations of State-provided ET&L trainings, and a survey of pilot district users revealed that pilot districts largely did not form goals for ET&L use, rather approaching system adoption with the goal of gathering information to decide whether they would implement it. Districts’ expectations for ET&L use, when applicable, primarily involved assessment development with the assessment tool.

More recent data collected after ET&L had become fully functional revealed continued focus on the assessment tool, but with some districts also forming expectations around use of the reporting tool and, to a lesser degree, the curriculum tool. Of the 22 district administrators we interviewed in summer 2014, five said that they were definitely planning to use ET&L in the subsequent school year. In these districts, administrators said that they intended to use ET&L for designing and using assessments (*n* = 4), using the reporting function to guide instruction (*n* = 3), as a unified place to house data on student performance (*n* = 2), as a place to store data on district determined measures (DDMs) (*n* = 1), for reviewing model curriculum units (*n* = 1), for curriculum mapping (*n* = 1), and for vocational competency tracking (*n* = 1). Coaches and teachers in four districts visited in fall 2014, all of which have adopted ET&L, were generally focused on using the assessment and reporting tools for developing and administering quarterly and formative assessments to track students’ growth.

Communication About ET&L

According to State ET&L leaders in formal interviews and evaluation team meetings, the message they wanted to communicate to districts is that ET&L is a cost-effective, integrated solution to address curriculum, assessment, and instructional needs, all in a single package that is less expensive than these components would be individually. State leaders also wanted to emphasize that ET&L offers resources for the statewide transition to the Common Core State Standards. Their modes of communication about ET&L in early stages of implementation included e-mail newsletters, a page on the ESE website, a Twitter feed, direct communication   
by phone or through district leader meetings, presentations at meetings of superintendent associations and statewide educator gatherings, and a series of webinar sessions attended by district administrators interested in the system.

Pilot district leaders indicated in interviews and in surveys that they received communication about ET&L through several of these modes, and they were largely able to identify State purposes for implementation. The majority of pilot district survey respondents (among both ET&L administrators and teachers) indicated that the State’s purpose for ET&L was to provide curriculum and assessment tools in a single system (97 percent of administrators and 79 percent of teachers), to provide tools and resources to support teaching and learning (86 percent of administrators and 67 percent of teachers), and to provide tools that help teachers assess student mastery of standards (83 percent of administrators and 80 percent of teachers).

A second survey in November 2014 drawn from a larger sample of 19 pilot and 21 nonpilot districts yielded similar results. About four fifths of respondents to the ET&L Administrator Survey reported having accessed ESE’s Edwin website, and a similar number reported having received information about ET&L training opportunities from ESE, their district, or both. However, few respondents reported regularly looking at the Edwin Twitter feed. (See .)

Table 6. Methods for Accessing ET&L Communications (Administrator Respondents)

| Please indicate Yes or No for the following statements. | *N* | Yes | No |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I have visited ESE’s Edwin website. | 50 | 82.0% | 18.0% |
| I receive information about ET&L training opportunities from ESE and/or my  district. | 49 | 79.6% | 20.4% |
| I regularly look at the Edwin Twitter feed. | 48 | 6.3% | 93.8% |

*Source:* ET&L Administrator Survey results

*Note*: This question was included in the administrator survey only. Maximum possible *N* for this item is 52.

In the surveys, 100 percent of administrators and 96 percent of teachers identified at least one major purpose for the State’s development of ET&L. (Respondents checked all that applied from a list of the State’s major purposes; purposes are presented in ). The top responses from both teachers and administrators were providing curriculum and assessment tools in a single system, providing tools and resources to support teaching and learning, and providing tools that help teachers assess student mastery of standards. All purposes provided in the item were identified by two thirds of administrators and more than two fifths of teachers, suggesting the state adequately communicated these purposes to a majority of respondents.

Figure 3. Percentage of Teachers and Administrators Identifying Various Purposes for Massachusetts’s Development of ET&L

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

Communication Challenges

Despite the apparent success of the State’s communication about ET&L, three major barriers interfered with districts’ reception of the messages about the system. Our findings show that although educators within districts demonstrated widespread **awareness** of State ET&L expectations about the system, they did not espouse similar expectations. As discussed in the EQ5 section, these barriers were among several barriers to ET&L adoption.

First, due to challenges with enabling SIF, full system operability, including the ability to administer assessments online and analyze student results, was delayed beyond ESE’s planned timeline of October 2013 to spring 2014. As a result, the State’s expressed expectation that ET&L operate as a comprehensive system could not come to fruition as initially communicated.

Second, the State’s communication about ET&L appeared to come from a single department within ESE. In an early interview, one district administrator reported that she had attended a state workshop about creating curriculum maps, but none of the presenters talked about how the process could work within ET&L. No other participant in our evaluation activities mentioned hearing about ET&L from other ESE departments or at other State trainings. In addition, informal conversations with ESE officials suggested miscommunication among departments about SIF operationalization, possibly further contributing to the slowed SIF implementation in districts.

Third, the State was unable to communicate the cost of ET&L to districts until 2014 because the per-student cost of the system is dependent on the number of districts that adopt it. Three of the 22 district administrators we interviewed in summer 2014 noted that their chief frustration about communication with the State was not being able to find out the cost of ET&L. As discussed in the EQ5 section, our findings indicate unease among districts about adopting a system for which they are unable to predict costs, even if they need not initially pay for it.

### Edwin Analytics Goals and Communication

In formal interviews at the outset of the evaluation, State Edwin Analytics leaders said that the State offers Edwin Analytics to districts so that educators can use student achievement data to make decisions about instruction. The State’s expectation for the system is that districts can easily access data on any of their students. Edwin Analytics is not a new system, and though information about the system is readily available through a page on the ESE website, webinars, and occasional regional meetings and trainings, State leaders reported that there are no concerted efforts to target communication at educators.

Nonetheless, survey results indicate that awareness of Edwin Analytics goals is high among users of the system. In the first Edwin Analytics survey, administered to a random sample of Edwin Analytics users, respondents demonstrated awareness of State’s goals. They reported accessing information about Edwin Analytics in multiple ways, including the ESE website, ESE and district direct communications, and Edwin Analytics webinars. The second survey yielded similar results. More than half of respondents *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that the State had clearly communicated the purpose of Edwin Analytics, and fewer than 17 percent *disagreed* or *strongly disagreed* with this statement. (See Table 7).

Table 7. State Communication of the Purpose of Edwin Analytics, as Perceived by System Users in November, 2014

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?** | ***N*** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Disagree** | **Neutral** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** |
| The State has clearly communicated the purpose of Edwin Analytics. | 142 | 1.4% | 15.5% | 28.2% | 43.7% | 11.3% |

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

District expectations for Edwin Analytics use largely mirrored the State’s expectations, perhaps as a result of the State’s communication, but also likely due to the way in which the system functions (i.e., as a data repository) and the length of time—nine years—that it (or its predecessor, the Educational Data Warehouse) has been available to districts. In the recent survey of Edwin Analytics users, most respondents indicated that their district’s expectations for the system included tracking assessment results (85 percent), identifying achievement gaps (78 percent), and identifying gaps in curriculum (61 percent). (See Figure 4.)

Figure 4. Percentage of Respondents Who Identified Various Major District Purposes for Edwin Analytics (*N* = 137)

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

## EQ2. How is ET&L training delivered, and what makes it more or less successful in terms of attaining ESE’s goals for the Edwin systems? How is training addressed for Edwin Analytics?

The State provided training for Edwin Analytics through a variety of sources, from online webinars to bimonthly conference calls to individual district trainings provided by ESE at district request. District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) were another important source of Edwin Analytics support and training. The State’s ET&L vendor offered ET&L training using a TTT model. Three key contacts attended the TTT from each district, with the expectation that they would in turn train educators according to their district’s plans and expectations for ET&L implementation. Pilot district attendees received a three-day, face-to-face training; however, in response to district concerns about the time required for these trainings, in fall 2013 the ET&L vendor designed and offered a virtual TTT to subsequent trainees. The virtual TTT consisted of four one-hour live webinars (also recorded and made available later), accompanied by Web-based training modules.

This section describes training delivery and outcomes for both systems, as well as learning resources available for ET&L. The face-to-face ET&L TTTs occurred prior to the evaluation time frame, so evaluation activities were focused on the virtual TTTs. However, participants in the evaluation from pilot districts had participated in face-to-face TTTs, so some information regarding those was available. Findings about ET&L TTTs and district trainings were based primarily on interviews with face-to-face TTT recipients (i.e., interviews with pilot district administrators), observations of the virtual ET&L TTTs and surveys with virtual TTT participants (23 respondents), observations of six ET&L trainings that TTT recipients provided in four districts, and ET&L user surveys. We also reviewed the online resources available to ET&L users. Findings about Edwin Analytics trainings were based on interviews with district administrators and user survey data.

Findings for ET&L TTTs and district trainings indicated that trainings were generally high quality, but that TTT participants nonetheless did not feel adequately prepared to train others (although some did provide trainings within their districts). Participants of all ET&L training types wanted additional training on the reporting and curriculum tools. We found that ET&L learning resources were generally easy to navigate and use, but it was difficult to find information about performing specific tasks within components of the system. Finally, most Edwin Analytics users indicated awareness of system training availability, but findings suggest that many users would benefit from more training.

### ET&L Trainings and Learning Resources

#### ET&L training has largely not resulted in system use. In the November 2014 ET&L user survey—the sample for which was defined by people who had received any type of ET&L training—only 52 percent of teachers surveyed (N = 134) and 50 percent of administrators surveyed (N = 50) reported using ET&L outside of training. This section examines possible reasons why trainings have not been effective in generating greater system usage, including TTTs, district trainings, and user resources. We first discuss the face-to-face and subsequent virtual TTTs, followed by district trainings, and we end with a discussion of learning resources.

Overall, face-to-face trainings, delivered by Thinkgate (the ET&L vendor), were viewed favorably by participants from the pilot districts: In interviews, pilot district administrators indicated overall satisfaction with the ET&L face-to-face TTTs and explicitly mentioned the value of interacting and collaborating with other educators as they planned training rollouts in their individual contexts. Complaints were minimal and centered on aspects of the training not controlled by the vendor. The primary complaint, mentioned by four district administrators, was that they were not allowed to train enough people, as they were limited to three trainees per district. The only other complaint, mentioned by two district administrators, was that the trainings were heavily focused on assessment and participants did not receive adequate information about other components of ET&L that were not operational at the time they were trained (e.g., the curriculum tool).

An important positive aspect of the face-to-face TTTs, and one that could easily be lost in virtual TTTs, was opportunity for collaboration. Our findings suggest that the ET&L TTT providers attempted to facilitate participant interactions during the virtual TTT by providing opportunities for people to engage in discussion. We did not observe that participants used these opportunities to interact over the phone line, but in a post-TTT survey, most respondents agreed that they had opportunities to interact with other participants from their district during the training. In addition, more than half agreed that they had an opportunity to interact with participants from other districts. We also observed that participants made frequent use of the webinar chat to ask questions on a variety of topics, and the trainers were very responsive, addressing each question through the chat or over the phone. (See *Technical Data Collection Report 3* [August 2014] for a full list of the questions.)

The virtual TTTs also were able to mitigate one of the negative aspects of the face-to-face TTTs, namely the policy of only allowing three trainees per district. ESE continued this policy by allowing only three active[[8]](#footnote-8) trainees per district. However, the virtual nature of the trainings meant that districts could invite as many people as they wished to be present during webinars, and ESE did not set a limit on access to the Web training modules (called Thinkgate University).

The virtual TTTs did not address the other negative aspect of the face-to-face TTT. As reported by the face-to-face participants, in our observations we found that that the main topic of the virtual TTTs was assessment development and reporting. This focus was appropriate on one hand, given that the primary expectation of most districts for ET&L is to use its assessment functions. On the other hand, not providing adequate training on the reporting and curriculum components seemed to have undermined the State’s goal for a comprehensive data and instruction system.

Finally, given that the purpose of the TTTs is to train participants to provide ET&L trainings in their own districts, we examined whether virtual TTT participants felt adequately prepared for this task. In the post-virtual TTT survey, the majority of respondents indicated that they did not feel that the sessions adequately prepared them to deliver ET&L training in their own districts. We also observed that these participants received very little direct guidance about providing district training. In the most recent round of district administrator interviews, most of whom attended virtual rather than face-to-face TTTs, results were mixed; among the 10 who answered a question about their preparation to train others, five said they would be able to train others how to use the system, but five said they were not prepared adequately to train others.[[9]](#footnote-9)

District ET&L Trainings

The amount and type of training that teachers received varied across and within districts. For example, teachers from two districts reported in focus groups that they attended webinars hosted by Thinkgate (i.e., the virtual TTTs), but some teachers from the same districts received training in department meetings only (possibly from virtual TTT attendees). Teachers from one focus group in another district reported that they received formal district training with a packet of information that had been created by a district trainer, and teachers in another focus group from the same district met in a small group with their department head for an informal introduction to ET&L. Teachers in a fourth district reported that they had not received any training but had been given a 10-minute introduction and began working in the system with the expectation that they would seek out help as they needed it.

This variation in district training types reported in focus groups also is reflected in the most recent ET&L user surveys. Respondents reported attending a variety of types of training, as shown in Table 8, but the largest training category was virtual TTTs (45.1 percent), suggesting that a much larger number of educators availed themselves of this resource than the three “active” users per district.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Table 8. Type of ET&L Training(s) Attended by Teacher and Administrator Survey Respondents

| Please describe the type of training you received on ET&L. (Check all that apply.) | (*N* = 186) |
| --- | --- |
| Face-to-face spring 2013 training for pilot districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE | 22.0% |
| Face-to-face training for other districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE | 6.5% |
| Face-to-face training provided by my district | 37.1% |
| Webinar and online training provided by Thinkgate and ESE | 45.1% |
| Self-paced training using Thinkgate University | 24.2% |

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

Teachers’ perceptions of their district trainings were generally positive, though not wholly so. Figure 5 shows the percentage of respondents in our November 2014 ET&L user survey who either agreed or strongly agreed with six statements about the quality of the training session they attended.[[11]](#footnote-11) About four fifths of respondents *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that the training prepared them to access the system and that their ET&L trainer was well prepared.A similar number agreed that the training included information about the online training resources available in Thinkgate University.However, fewer respondents *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that the training prepared them to use the system (67 percent) and that the training answered questions they had (66 percent). Furthermore, more than half of respondents (59 percent) *agreed* or *strongly agreed* with this statement: The training had technical difficulties that hindered the presentation. Similarly, in focus groups, participants from two districts reported that they still had questions about the system, but that the training was good. In the other two districts, focus-group participants reported not feeling adequately trained by their district trainers.

Figure 5. Percentage of Respondents Who *Agreed* or *Strongly Agreed* With Statements About ET&L Training (*N* = 175–183)[[12]](#footnote-12)

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Note*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

In addition to quality of training, we also examined the components of ET&L for which districts provided training. Survey respondents were asked about the amount of time their ET&L training spent on the assessment tools, curriculum tools, digital resources, and reporting components. For each of these components, respondents indicated whether the time spent in training was *too little*, *about right*, or *too much* or that their *training did not address this* topic. As shown in Figure 6, nearly two thirds of respondents (64 percent) reported their training spent the right amount of time on assessment tools. Fewer respondents, however, said the same about the reporting component, curriculum tools, or digital resources. In fact, a majority of respondents reported too little time was spent on, or the training did not address, these three components. Very few respondents reported spending too much time on any of these areas. These results are unsurprising given that these components were not discussed much in the virtual TTTs, where many respondents said they received their training (see the previous section on District ET&L Trainings).

Figure 6. Survey Respondents’ Perception of Time Spent on ET&L Components in Training (*N* = 172–179)

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys. *Note*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

As might be expected from the results shown in Figure 6,many of the survey respondents indicated that they wanted additional training or resources on ET&L (Figure 7). Respondents wanted more training or resources on how to generate reports based on assessments, how to access digital content, how to create curriculum units and resources, and how to use mapping tools. Fewer respondents indicated that they wanted additional training or resources for administering and creating assessments, how to align assessments to standards, and how to use vocational technical competency tracking resources.

Figure 7. Percentage of Respondents Who Indicated That They Would Like to Receive Additional Training or Resources on Various Topics (*N* = 160)

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

Other ET&L Training Resources

As noted in the previous section, districts varied in the amount and type of ET&L training they provided. Thinkgate addressed this issue to some degree by making available Web-based training modules (Thinkgate University) to all system users in fall 2013. ET&L also contains the Reference Center, a searchable interface with currently more than 200 reference files. However, awareness of these resources appears to be somewhat low. In our think-aloud observations with 28 educators, only 11 participants mentioned some use of either feature. And only 66 percent of the 181 ET&L user survey respondents reported that they were aware of the training reference materials available through Thinkgate University; 34 percent reported they were not aware of these materials. The next two sections describe our analysis of Thinkgate University and the Reference Center. Our overall finding is that these resources appear to be appropriate to help users understand general features of the system, but that they may not be sufficient to train users to implement ET&L in their own educational context or to complete complex tasks. Not unexpectedly, it appears that training or guidance from another experienced person is important for most educators to use the system successfully.

#### Thinkgate University

Our review of the Thinkgate University modules in *Technical Data Collection Report 3*(August 2014) found that they are easy to navigate, providing step-by-step instructions and authentic tasks for users. Their greatest drawback is that they are generic in nature, so learners do not receive information about the performance context (i.e., the context in which the learners will use the skills they learn). For example, one teacher who had used them as her primary source of training said in a focus group, “I felt okay. I went through these modules. But I didn’t feel that I could walk away after going through those modules and sit down and be able to create an assessment.”

#### ET&L Reference Center

At the time of our analysis in January 2015, the ET&L Reference Center contained238 references in a variety of formats, including PDF, Excel, and PowerPoint, as well as videos and recorded webinars. We reviewed this resource by seeking information about and then using the information to perform 18 tasks within ET&L in three areas: (1) assessment, (2) reporting, and (3) curriculum. These tasks represented general functions as well as functions that had posed difficulties for educators, as described in interviews and focus groups. (See Table 9 for the list of tasks.

Table 9. List of Tasks for Edwin Reference Center Document Analysis

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment Tasks** |
| * Create and save individual assessment items (self-written or selected from item bank; all subjects) * Find all the ELA assessment items that pertain to a given passage * Reorder items in the “Make it Quick” assessment * Create whole assessments with “Make it Quick” * Create whole assessments with “Create My Own” (e.g., to import one’s own assessments) * Import an image or a passage into the assessment * Adjust font sizes in an assessment * Administer assessments using bubble sheets (on paper) * Administer assessments online (or with clickers) |
| **Reporting Tasks** |
| * Run an assessment results report at the classroom, school, and district levels * Generate a report for individual students (i.e., standards by student) * Track a student’s vocational competencies |
| **Curriculum Tasks** |
| * Use Model Curriculum Units available from ESE (involves locating and downloading; modifications also possible within ET&L) * Find curriculum map/unit plan that someone else has made * Import lesson plans made in previous years * Create a curriculum resource * Create a curriculum unit * Use the mapping tools to plan/schedule curriculum delivery |

For each task, we rated the ease of locating guidance within the document as well as the clarity of instructions. The reviewers logged into demonstration accounts for teachers and administrators, and they searched for user documents within each of these accounts respectively.

Overall, it was easy to find guidance on most of these tasks, and this guidance was helpful in showing how to accomplish the task. As shown in Figure 8, overall, the reviewers found that locating guidance within reference documents was easy for more than three fourths of the tasks (78 percent). For two of the 18 tasks (11 percent)—(a) Reorder items in the “Make it Quick” assessment and (b) Import lesson plans made in previous years*—*guidance was rated as available but hard to locate. The reviewers were unable to locate guidance for an additional two tasks (11 percent), namely (a) Adjust font sizes in an assessment and (b) Use Model Curriculum Units available from ESE.

Figure 8. Ratings Summary for Availability of Guidance Within Documents, All Tasks

However, our raters noted some limitations of the Reference Center. First, the Reference Center search function searches only document titles. As a result, it was easy to find appropriate reference documents for more general tasks within ET&L, especially if the name of the task closely mirrored the document label (e.g., creating an assessment with “Make it Quick”). However, locating instructions for subtasks within a larger task (e.g., adjusting font sizes in an assessment) was much more difficult. Locating subtask guidance typically required guessing which document was most likely to address a task and scrolling through it. Documents did not include tables of contents. Thus, when it was not evident which document would be most likely to have instructions for a subtask, it was hard to locate the appropriate guidance.

After we located an appropriate document, instructions were typically easy to follow. The numbering scheme and related screen shots with numbered flags made it easy to complete the step-by-step instructions for most tasks, especially when the steps mirrored the system’s screens. However, in some cases, the screen shots in the instructions did not mirror system screens, especially for the curriculum tasks. The review indicated that parallel to the findings for locating guidance, the instructions, once located, were rated as being clear for most of the tasks (14 of 18; 78 percent), although they were unclear for two of the tasks. (For the remaining two tasks, this rating was not applicable because reviewers were unable to locate instructions for the task.) The two tasks with “unclear” guidance were (a) Create a curriculum resource and (b) Create a curriculum unit; for both of these, the image in the guidance document did not match the image of the ET&L system available to the reviewers.

Edwin Analytics Training

Six of 13 ET&L pilot district administrators and 11 of 22 district administrators in later interviews reported that district staff had been trained on Edwin Analytics, either by ESE or through a DSAC. The remaining administrators either did not know if training had been provided or reported that no one in the district had received Edwin Analytics training. However, it seems that the majority of Edwin Analytics users are aware of available information and training resources. In our most recent survey, the majority of Edwin Analytics users (86 percent) reported visiting ESE’s Edwin website. About three fourths of respondents reported receiving information about Edwin Analytics training opportunities from ESE or their district (71 percent), and a majority reported receiving information about Edwin Analytics webinars (56 percent). Fewer than half of respondents (42 percent) reported receiving information about Edwin Analytics EWIS video tutorials. (See Table 10.)

Table 10. Methods for Accessing Information about Edwin Analytics

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Please indicate Yes or No for the following statements.** | ***N*** | **Yes** | **No** |
| I have visited ESE’s Edwin website. | 138 | 86.2% | 13.8% |
| I received information about Edwin Analytics training opportunities  from ESE and/or my district. | 138 | 71.0% | 29.0% |
| I received information about Edwin Analytics webinars. | 138 | 55.8% | 44.2% |
| I received information about Edwin Analytics EWIS video tutorials. | 133 | 42.1% | 57.9% |

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

Nonetheless, as we discuss later, survey participants reported that the two main barriers to using Edwin Analytics are that it is not user-friendly and that they need additional training. Also, users tend to access a limited range of reports in Edwin Analytics (see Section EQ3). Although it is very possible that this limited range suits the users’ needs, one focus group participant said, “There’s actually a lot in Analytics I didn’t know about. At the webinar, we found out we weren’t actually using as much as we could.” These data point to the need for more user training, something that will become more important as more educators gain access to the system in the coming months and years.

## EQ3. Who uses ET&L, and how do they use it? Edwin Analytics?

Our evaluation examined how users access and make use of both systems using a variety of data sources, with attention to how educators are using the systems to address student achievement gaps. Our primary source of data was system usage data, especially from the Edwin Analytics system, for which we examined reports generated from the menu-driven interface. Usage data provide valuable quantitative information about how often users access the systems and which tasks within each system they engage in. However, they do not provide information about users’ purposes in accessing the system or what they do offline with the data and information they access. Therefore, we also used interview and survey data, asking users which portions of each system they use most and for what purposes.

This section describes our findings in this area for each system, followed by an analysis of how both systems are used to address achievement gaps. Our findings indicated an expansion since earlier phases of the evaluation in functions that ET&L users access—from assessment development only to development, administration, and reporting of assessments—but also that most users do not access ET&L’s curricular and digital resource tools. Despite the apparent expansion in functions, there were relatively few ET&L users overall.

We observed little variation in use of Edwin Analytics, which users continued to access primarily for MCAS data. Data indicated that financial reporting, a new function in Analytics, was the least used feature.

### ET&L Users

Since the State introduced ET&L in March 2013, relatively few districts have adopted it. The 22,196 active account holders in the time frame for which we have data (July 2014–January 2015) were registered in a total of 85 districts. These districts accounted for 57 percent of the 150 districts that had indicated to the State that they wanted to participate in ET&L as of November 2014, and 85 percent of the 100 districts that were SIF-enabled.

ET&L usage within districts with active accounts also was low. Usage data show that fewer than 4 percent of 22,196 account holders logged into the system per month. (See Table 11.)[[13]](#footnote-13)

Table 11. ET&L Login Statistics

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Month** | **Total Logins** | **Unique Users Who Logged In** | **Percentage of Account Holders Who Logged In** | **Average Number of Logins per User  Who Logged In** |
| August 2014 | 712 | 133 | 0.6% | 5.4 |
| September 2014 | 2,919 | 352 | 1.6% | 8.3 |
| October 2014 | 3,973 | 551 | 2.5% | 7.2 |
| November 2014 | 6,639 | 811 | 3.7% | 8.2 |
| December 2014 | 4,139 | 654 | 2.9% | 6.3 |

*Note:* July 2014 is omitted from the table because there was no login activity in that month. January 2015 is omitted because we did not receive data for the entire month (there were 1,234 logins in January).

### ET&L Uses

Since the beginning of this evaluation, we have consistently found that the primary use of the ET&L system is for assessment. This finding is unsurprising, given the focus on assessment among districts with expectations for the system and the emphasis on the assessment feature in ET&L trainings. The emphasis on assessment may have in turn been due to the fact that other features of the system were not fully functional during early stages of the implementation. Our most recent round of data collection yielded similar findings about assessment, although we also found frequent use of the related reporting tool. In this section, we summarize findings about how users engage in ET&L from data collected in fall 2014 in think-aloud observations, surveys, and system usage data. We first describe use of the assessment and reporting tools, followed by use of other tools.

Assessment and Reporting Tools

Of the 28 ET&L users in our think-aloud observations, 23 demonstrated use of the ET&L assessment tool, signaling their ability to access and use it. Nine users described or demonstrated the “Create Your Own” assessment feature. Nine other users demonstrated the “Make it Quick” feature, which allows users to quickly construct assessments from pre-established items. Five participants reported that they administer or print out assessments that were created by others in their district, and that they themselves have not yet learned how to create assessments in ET&L.

Test administration with ET&L was not possible to observe in the context of the think-aloud, so we asked participants what they would do next after creating an assessment in the system. Only three participants said that they administer ET&L-created assessments online. Nine others reported that they print out assessments to administer to students on paper. The most commonly cited reason for this approach was limited access to computers for their students. In four cases, participants who administer assessments on paper explained that they subsequently enter student responses into the ET&L system either manually or by scanning bubble sheets into the system. Others tabulate assessment results by hand or enter the data into Excel, and therefore do not use ET&L for analyzing student responses. (They did not provide a reason for this.) The remaining participants who use the assessment feature did not explicitly say whether they administer ET&L assessments on paper or online.

System usage data corroborate qualitative findings about how users interact with ET&L. In our usage data analysis time frame, the top use was assessment creation.[[14]](#footnote-14) Users created 913 district tests, 403 of which were administered to about 41,000 students. Users created a larger number of classroom tests (1,447) but used ET&L to administer (either online or using printed bubble sheets) only 216 tests to about 10,582 students. It is likely, but impossible to determine, that most of the unadministered tests were developed by learners who were experimenting with the assessment tool. (See Table 12.)

Table 12. Tests Created, Administered, and Taken at the Classroom and District Levels

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total Tests Created** | **Total Tests Administered** | **Total Students Taking Tests** | **Percentage of Students Who Took a Test** |
| Classroom test | 1,447 | 216 | 10,582 | 5% |
| District test | 913 | 403 | 41,036 | 19% |

*Note:* The percentage of students who took a test is taken from the total number of students in districts that  
 committed to using the system in the 2014–15 school year (219,029 students).

As reflected in the think-aloud observation data, usage data showed that educators were much more likely to administer assessments on paper than online (as ratios: approximately 4:1 for classroom tests and approximately 6:1 for district tests). Figure 9 and Figure 10 show overall test administration types for district and classroom tests, by school level. District tests were more likely to be administered on paper at all school levels. For classroom tests, span schools almost never administered tests online. In elementary schools, a greater proportion of classroom tests were taken online, but among high schools and middle schools the ratios were closer to even.

Figure 9. Proportion of ET&L District Tests Taken Online Versus on Paper, by School Level and Overall

*Note:* 6,287 classroom tests were taken in elementary schools (4,924 on paper and 1,363 online); 8,622 were taken in high schools (8,068 on paper and 554 online); 10,914 were taken in middle schools (8,788 on paper and 2,126 online); 15,213 were taken in span schools (13,073 on paper and 2,140 online); and 41,036 were taken overall (34,853 on paper and 6,183 online).

Figure 10. Proportion of ET&L Classroom Tests Taken Online Versus on Paper, by School Level and Overall

*Note:* 93 classroom tests were taken in elementary schools (25 on paper and 68 online); 5,186 were taken in high schools (2,992 on paper and 2,194 online); 1,339 were taken in middle schools (826 on paper and 513 online); 3,964 were taken in span schools (3,893 on paper and 71 online); and 10,582 were taken overall (7,736 on paper and 2,846 online).

Survey results indicated that a substantial portion of administrators and some teachers also use the reporting feature of the assessment tool.[[15]](#footnote-15) Respondents were asked to rate the frequency of various assessment tools. As expected, the most frequent usage was part of the “Make it Quick” feature of assessment creation: Use MCAS items to create an assessment(with 83 percent of administrators and 30 percent of teachers reporting usage at least a few times per semester). However, approximately 40 percent of administrators and 15 percent of teachers selected the second most popular choice: Generate standard data reports. shows the percentage of responses for each survey choice.

Figure 11. Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Using the Student Assessment Tools *at Least a Few Times per Semester* to Do Various Tasks

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Note 1:* Responses from 65 teachers and 25 administrators who indicated that they have not used ET&L outside of training were excluded from the findings.

*Note 2*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

The ET&L reporting feature also was the second most popular feature demonstrated by the think-aloud observation participants, after creating assessments. Eight of the 26 ET&L users in the think-alouds said that they use the reporting feature to review and analyze assessment results. In five cases, educators use the reporting feature to examine results from assessments they have created themselves. In the other three cases, educators said they use the reporting feature to examine results from assessments administered by others, such as districtwide benchmark assessments. Among the ET&L reporting options, the distracter analysis was the most popular, named by six think-aloud observation participants as their favorite reporting feature.

Survey responses indicated that the three most popular uses for the reporting tool included identifying student groups for instruction, identifying individual students who need remedial instruction, and identifying individual students who need extensions or challenges. Approximately one third of administrators and one fifth of teachers reported using ET&L data   
at least *a few times per semester* this school year for these purposes. (See Figure 12 for the eight uses rated.)

Figure 12. Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Using the Data From Assessment Tools *at Least a Few Times per Semester* to Do Various Tasks

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Note 1:* Responses from 65 teachers and 25 administrators who indicated that they have not used ET&L outside of training were excluded from the findings.

*Note 2*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

The number of people who access data directly in ET&L is not necessarily indicative of how many people ultimately see or use them, if ET&L users share data with others. The survey therefore also examined whether and with whom ET&L users discussed student assessment tool data or reports. As might be expected, administrators provided a higher indication of discussing data with others, with close to 80 percent reporting that they share ET&L student assessment data with team leaders or coaches, or with other administrators. Teachers most commonly reported sharing data with other teachers (65 percent, and the same proportion of administrators also reported sharing data with teachers. Few administrators or teachers (less than 20 percent) reported sharing data or reports with parents or students. See Figure 13 for details.

Figure 13. Percentage of Teacher and Administrator Respondents Who Discussed ET&L Student Assessment Tool Data or Reports With Various Stakeholders

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Note:* Responses from 65 teachers and 25 administrators who indicated that they have not used ET&L outside of training were excluded from the findings.

Instruction and Curriculum Tools

Reported use of ET&L features besides assessment and reporting was rare. During the think-aloud observations, only two of the 28 participants reported that they had ever used the instruction component, which includes curriculum planning tools and Massachusetts’s MCUs. In district administrator interviews, only two participants reported that their districts were using the MCUs in ET&L. One district administrator noted that the district was using the science units at the elementary level and that two recently hired curriculum coordinators would be “looking at small ways to grow teachers’ capacity to use those resources.” The other district administrator indicated that the district was looking closely at the available MCUs to see how they could best be used with existing units.

Survey results also indicated that use of nonassessment features of ET&L are relatively rare.   
The most frequently reported use of the curriculum tool (Search for instructional materials by standard) was selected by only 13 percent of administrators and 10 percent of teachers (see Figure 14). For the digital resources, only 9 percent of administrators and 3 percent of teachers selected the most frequently used feature (Include digital resources in a lesson plan) (see Figure 15).

Figure 14. Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Using the Curriculum Tools *at Least a Few Times per Semester* for Various Tasks

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Note 1:* Responses from 65 teachers and 25 administrators who indicated that they have not used ET&L outside of training were excluded from the findings.

*Note 2*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

Figure 15. Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Using the Digital Resources *at Least a Few Times per Semester* for Various Tasks

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Note:* Responses from 65 teachers and 25 administrators who indicated that they have not used ET&L outside of training were excluded from the findings.

True to users’ self-reports of usage in the qualitative and survey data, users created very few instructional materials in ET&L during the usage data analysis time frame. From July through December 2014 the largest number of users creating instructional materials in a given month was 11 (in July),[[16]](#footnote-16) and on average there were about seven users creating instructional materials each month. These users created 45 curriculum maps, 155 unit plans, 181 lesson plans, and 35 “other” instructional materials.

### Edwin Analytics Users and Uses

In *Technical Data Collection Report 4* (October 2014), we reported on Edwin Analytics usage data generated over the course of a calendar year, from June 2, 2013, to June 8, 2014. In order to confirm the robustness of trends we observed in these data, we repeated the analysis with usage data generated over the 19-month period between June 2, 2013, and December 28, 2014.[[17]](#footnote-17) We also compared data generated during the same calendar months, but across different calendar years, to confirm that users were still accessing the same aspects of Edwin Analytics.

Our extended analysis showed the same usage patterns as those we had observed previously. As we reported, most individual users access the system infrequently. We calculated frequency by examining the number of users who accessed a report in a given five-week period. Over our 19-month analysis time frame, half of all users (50.1%) accessed the system within only one of these five-week periods (see Figure 16).

Figure 16. Number of Weeks in Which Users Generated Reports, June 2013–December 2014 (*N =* 7,393 users)

*Note:* The total possible number of weeks in which a user could have generated a report was 83.

By contrast, Edwin Analytics survey responses suggest that respondents perceived a greater frequency of use than the usage data suggest; as shown in Table 13, more than 60 percent of respondents reported using the system *somewhat frequently* or *very frequently*. This relatively high level of frequency may reflect the fact that the survey was conducted in November, a time of year that generally falls at the end of a period of high usage; our 19-month analysis shows dramatic spikes in usage in August–October 2013 and 2014, which corresponds with when MCAS results become available (see Figure 17). Survey respondents may have therefore been reflecting on their recent experience, rather than considering the frequency over the entire year.

Table 13. Reported Frequency of Use of Edwin Analytics System (*N* = 140)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **How often have you used Edwin Analytics in the past year?** | **Percentage** |
| Never | 3.6% |
| Occasionally | 35.7% |
| Somewhat frequently | 29.3% |
| Very frequently | 31.4% |

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

Figure 17. Total Number of Reports Generated Each Week, June 2013–December 2014   
(*N* = 7,393 Users)

Survey respondents appear to be aware of increased usage during this period; they most frequently reported using Edwin Analytics at the beginning of the school year and in the summer before the start of the school year (see Figure 18).

Figure 18. Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Typically Using Edwin Analytics at Various Times (*N* = 135)

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

The spikes in usage are likely due in part to the release of MCAS results in the fall; the most commonly used features of Edwin Analytics were reports that produced tables of student-level MCAS results (see Table 14).

Table 14. Top 10 Most Frequently Generated Reports, June 15, 2014–December 28, 2014

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Report Name | Times Generated | **Previous Rank**[[18]](#footnote-18) |
| MCAS Student Item Analysis Roster (IT616) | 107,316 | 2 |
| MCAS Student Roster (All Subjects) (PE617) | 96,337 | 1 |
| Achievement and Growth by Teacher | 65,277 | 5 |
| Assessment History Summary (PE613) | 63,739 | 3 |
| MCAS School Achievement Distribution by Year (PE405) | 60,293 | 7 |
| MCAS School Results by Standards (CU406) | 55,021 | 6 |
| Assessment Detail (PE606) | 50,477 | 4 |
| MCAS Results by Achievement Level: School, District, and State Comparison (PE403) | 41,198 | 10 |
| MCAS School Results by Subgroup (PE404) | 37,587 | 11 |
| MCAS School Test Item Analysis Summary (IT401) | 36,755 | 9 |

Survey data show extensive use of MCAS data through item analysis, student growth analysis, and achievement analysis, but also provide a more nuanced picture of users’ preferences for other types of uses (see Figure 19). The least frequently identified uses were district finances, postsecondary analysis, staffing indicators, and district-determined measures; most respondents reported using Edwin Analytics for these infrequently accessed report types *minimally* or *not at all*.

Figure 19. Extent to Which Edwin Analytics Users Reported Accessing Various Edwin Analytics Reports (*N* = 119–137)

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

*Note*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

Survey data also provide an opportunity to examine what users do with Analytics data offline, as well as their purposes in accessing them. Offline data use is reportedly frequent. Most Analytics users (88 percent) reported using the data pulled from Edwin Analytics with other staff in their school or district in a variety of settings. The most common settings in which the data were used were leadership team meetings (see Figure 20). Two thirds of respondents reported using the data in content area or department meetings, in grade-level meetings, and in district-level meetings. This finding is of interest because, as noted in the EQ5 section, interview data suggest that most districts have not opted to give Edwin Analytics access to teachers, although the State has provided this option and has created several classroom-level reports specifically for teachers. It appears from these findings that teachers primarily gain information about data from administrators rather than accessing the system directly.

Figure 20. Percentage of Respondents Who Discussed Edwin Analytics Data With Other Staff Members in Their School or District in Various Ways (*N* = 123)

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

We also examined Edwin Analytics users’ purpose for accessing data, asking them to rate the extent to which they used the data for multiple purposes on a 4-point scale from *not at all* to *extensively*. Respondents most frequently reported using the data to track assessment results, with 76 percent doing so *moderately* or *extensively* (Figure 21). Many respondents also reported using the data to identify achievement gaps and to identify individual students who need remedial assistance. Fewer respondents used it to identify individual students who are off track for graduation, with two fifths saying they never used it for this purpose. Nearly all respondents (95 percent) reported *not at all* or *minimally* using the data to track expenditures and resource allocation.

In the next section, we examine the third most commonly selected purpose, identifying achievement gaps,in more detail, as addressing achievement gaps is a State goal for the Edwin systems.

Figure 21. Extent to Which Edwin Analytics Users Accessed Edwin Analytics Data for Various Purposes (*N* = 122–137)

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

*Note*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

### Using the Edwin Systems to Address the Achievement Gap

We examined how educators use or plan to use ET&L to address achievement gaps in our qualitative data collection throughout the evaluation, particularly in our interviews with district leaders and our observation of training sessions. Findings were sparse. Only two pilot district interviewees out of 13 reported that they expected to use an Edwin system to reduce the achievement gap, and none of the district training sessions explicitly mentioned achievement gaps. However, discussions of using the reporting tool to differentiate data by subgroups (race or ethnicity, students with disabilities, ELLs, and low socioeconomic status) were observed in four of the six training sessions.

In order to examine the use of Edwin Analytics data to address achievement gaps among traditionally underperforming subpopulations, in the first phase of the evaluation we analyzed variation in Edwin Analytics usage among districts with large populations of ELLs, low-income students, and students with disabilities. We found little variation in monthly average number of reports per user.[[19]](#footnote-19) Thus, use of Edwin Analytics did not vary substantially across districts with different proportions of subpopulations of students.

In the most recent phase of data collection, participants in think-aloud observations and focus groups who addressed the issue of the achievement gap discussed it in terms of focusing on the needs of individual students rather than subgroups. For example, in the think-aloud observations, seven of the 28 respondents discussed achievement gaps, but only one discussed it in terms of student subgroups. The other six said that they use the data to identify gaps in individual students’ performances, to see where they might need additional intervention. More recent focus groups with school administrators and coaches yielded similar results, with those who discussed the issue generally focusing on using data to identify individual students’ needs. Similarly, as previously noted and in , Edwin Analytics users who participated in the November 2014 survey more commonly reported using data to identify individual students who need remedial assistance than to identify achievement gaps (though arguably addressing individual students’ needs will close these gaps).

## EQ4. In what ways has implementation of each Edwin system been successful or not successful, and why?

We primarily addressed EQ4 by examining benefits of the system for educators and barriers to system use, as well as the availability of support for using each system. Our primary source of data about specific facilitators and challenges of Edwin systems use is the think-aloud observations, in which we observed people using both systems as they told us about their experience. Of the 28 think-aloud participants, 18 (64.3 percent) experienced a mix of successes and challenges in executing desired system features (either those they sought to show us during free navigation or structured scenarios we provided). These participants were able to demonstrate and successfully navigate some of the features, functions, and tasks that they intended to use in one or both systems, but they ran into challenges when trying to access, navigate, or execute other features and functions. Fifteen percent of the think-aloud observation participants experienced no success at all in executing any system features or functions, both during free navigation and structured scenarios. These participants were unable to access the site; find the features or data they sought; or figure out how they could produce reports, create assessments, or find needed information. Finally, nearly 21 percent of the participants were adept at successfully using all desired Edwin system features and functions. These six participants did not appear to encounter any challenges or obstacles during the think-aloud sessions.

The rest of this section looks at each system separately. We begin with a discussion of ET&L, with the overall finding that although people generally liked its capabilities (especially assessment and reporting features), usability was a challenge. Many users reported that ET&L was not intuitive. As described in this section, the issue of intuitiveness was exacerbated by technology challenges and system glitches. Other challenges served as barriers to use at the district level, including the delay in the system functionality rollout and lack of information about cost.

Users of Edwin Analytics, discussed next in this section, seem to be highly satisfied with the system and its capabilities. However, no comparison between systems is justified, as these users tend to be district data analysts or in a similar technology or data-heavy role. Observations revealed that few Edwin Analytics users were able to complete tasks other than those they are used to doing, signaling that as Edwin Analytics is made available to more teachers, it will be important to ensure good training and usability.

### ET&L Benefits

Think-aloud observation participants noted several key positive aspects of the assessment and reporting components of ET&L. They reported that the “Make it Quick” feature in the assessment tool offers convenience and efficiency and “Create Your Own” offers flexibility.   
Of the 21 participants who demonstrated their use of the ET&L assessment feature, seven participants remarked that they particularly appreciated the ability to link items to the standards when creating assessments in ET&L, and two explicitly noted using the item difficulty ratings feature when creating assessments to enable them to balance out easier and more challenging items on a classroom test. Online test administration was another aspect of ET&L that several participants noted was helpful. In particular, the four participants who said that they have used the online administration option felt that this was a very desirable feature. One noted that it helped prepare her students for the PARCC assessments, which also will be administered online. Another said that having the online option allowed her district to assess students more frequently.

Among the eight think-aloud observation participants who use the ET&L reporting feature, five participants explicitly mentioned that they like to use the distracter analysis, a reporting option in ET&L that shows how students responded to every item, allowing teachers to identify students’ misconceptions or patterns of incorrect responses. Other reporting features reported to be helpful included examining results by standards, sorting results by classroom teacher and subgroups, and being able to see results immediately following the administration of assessments. Three of the participants said that they use ET&L reporting results to identify the needs of students, and two participants said they use ET&L reporting results to inform the professional development needs of teachers. One participant also noted that students’ time spent in online assessments is another type of helpful data. She said, “There’s no way a sophomore in high school can read three short texts and answer 25 multiple-choice questions in 16 minutes.…This is something you look at. It’s not only how do they perform, but how much time they spend connected to the exam.”

These benefits were echoed in focus groups with coaches and teachers, who also made note of the item difficulty ratings, the ability to link assessment items to standards, the ability to customize assessments, the availability of instant assessment results, and the ability to perform subgroup analyses with the results. Two coaches also said that the assessments are very user-friendly to students when administered online.

ET&L user surveys further corroborated qualitative data findings about ET&L benefits, especially the inclusion of standards. The most frequently endorsed perceived benefit of ET&L was inclusion of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and Common Core State Standards, selected by roughly three fourths of teachers (74 percent) and administrators (76 percent) (Figure 22). The next two most frequently identified benefits of ET&L were its perceived consistency with other statewide initiatives (selected by 61 percent of administrators and 34 percent of teachers) and its inclusion of digital content (60 percent administrators; 29 percent teachers). Fewer administrators (47percent) *strongly agreed* or *agreed* with the statement that the multiple functionalities in ET&L make it more convenient than other tools, a key component of the system.

Figure 22. Percentage of Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed With Various Perceived Benefits of ET&L

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Note*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

### ET&L Challenges

Despite the positive features of the ET&L system, challenges reported by educators during think-alouds and focus groups were much more prevalent than benefits. The nature of the challenges experienced and reported by participants fell primarily into two categories: usability and technological issues.

Usability

We define usability challenges as those related to users’ ability to navigate system features or execute desired tasks.[[20]](#footnote-20) During the 24 ET&L think-aloud observations, we observed that 18 participants experienced usability challenges and that they experienced such challenges repeatedly. (We observed these 18 users experiencing 87 distinct usability challenges.)

Fourteen think-aloud participants encountered issues related to the system interface and navigation features. One particular challenge was the icons. Three think-aloud participants said during the observation that the icons were unclear (i.e., did not easily convey their purpose) or badly placed. Participants in a coach focus group also noted the difficulty with icons. One said, “For example, one of the icons is a spaceship. No one knows what they’re going to find with it unless they’ve been taught or seen it before, and it’s easy to forget.” Other participants said that labels didn’t make sense; that they weren’t sure how to find needed information on students, assessments, or how to execute tasks; and that the system was simply not “intuitive.”

Many think-aloud observation participants said they wished the system was more “user-friendly,” and “simpler to use,” meaning that they would have preferred to learn to navigate the system on their own rather than depending on a manual or trainer. Both think-aloud observation and focus-group participants said that the ET&L system is time consuming to learn, and that it is difficult to remember the specific steps required to use the tools.

Survey participants’ difficulty ratings of various features of the student assessment tools (Figure 23) appear to support the think-aloud observation and focus group findings, but not so the instructional tools (curriculum planning tools and digital resources, Figure 24). Overall, the functions rated *difficult* by one fourth or more of respondents included using key data system items to create an assessment, using third-party items to create an assessment, tracking vocational/technical competencies, and generating standard data reports—all assessment tool features. The tasks rated *straightforward* by the most people (60 percent or more) included using MCAS and NWEA items to create an assessment (assessment, Figure 23), reviewing digital resources, planning curriculum delivery, utilizing MCUs, and searching for instructional materials by standard (instructional tools, Figure 24).

Figure 23. Ease or Difficulty of Student Assessment Tool Components (*N* = 15–71)

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Notes*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.Participants who reported never using a given feature were excluded from the analysis.   
Low *N*s indicated components that few users reported using.

Figure 24. Ease or Difficulty Ratings of Instructional Tools (*N* = 14–38)

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Note 1*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

*Note 2:* Participants who reported never using a given feature were excluded from the analysis. Low *N*s indicated components that few users reported using.

Disparities in think-aloud observation participants’ and survey participants’ perceptions of difficulty likely have two primary sources. First, the think-aloud observation participants were in districts that have elected to use ET&L, and they therefore had more depth of experience with the system than the average survey respondent (who might not have used the system outside of training). Second, the think-aloud observation participants were reacting to the system directly   
as they used it, rather than relying on memory. The think-aloud observation participants’ experiences therefore provide insight into general system usability issues, and the survey participants provide insight into users’ general perceptions of system usability.

However, as people gain more depth of experience with ET&L, their perceptions may shift if system usability issues continue. The think-aloud observations we employed in this round of data collection, in concert with focus groups with school-level users, allowed us to identify specific usability challenges that users experience, at least some of the time, in using ET&L. We present these challenges in Table 15.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Table 15. List of ET&L System Difficulties Identified by Users in Focus Groups and   
Think-Aloud Observations

|  |
| --- |
| ***System Access***   * Teachers get locked out of the system for entering their password incorrectly. (After one incorrect entry, the default screen to which the system takes users is incorrect, leading some teachers to enter correct passwords on the second and third try, and get locked out.)   ***Missing Data***   * Student or subgroup data do not always populate reports consistently; the data can be present one day and gone the next. * Duplicate teachers and students appear in the system or are missing, and changes have to be made by uploading files manually to Thinkgate. * The system does not carry over assessments and results from one year to the next.   ***Assessment Development***   * Available items do not mirror PARCC items (e.g., multiple select response choices). * In ELA assessments, a new passage is provided for every standard, making it more time consuming for ELA teachers to find items for developing reasonable-length assessments. * Specialist teachers (e.g., computer, library) can’t make an assessment and administer it to their students; they have to give the assessment to a core content teacher to administer, and then the teacher has to supply them with the results. * Item issues:   + Math images are sometimes blurry or small.   + Items print with variable font sizes and spacing.   + Graphics sometimes disappear when printed.   + When students take an assessment online, the questions do not consistently appear next to the passage.   + System won’t accept addendums, or addendum is superimposed over the question when it prints.   + Errors occur in item bank items, such as misspellings, missing distracters, or identical distracters.   ***Assessment Administration and Reporting***   * Test IDs change every time there is a data update (e.g., entry of new student), so that if teachers print out bubble sheets in advance, the sheets can become obsolete (i.e., unscannable) before use. * When students get kicked out of the system and log back in during an assessment, some have been taken to a different student’s test. * Data from quarterly tests do not update as quickly as desired (i.e., same day). * Reporting tables appear with misaligned columns. * Reports do not fit onto a single printable page. * Filtering functions do not always operate properly, even when instructions were followed. * Data labels are sometimes unclear (i.e., labels do not adequately convey the source(s) of data being displayed). |

Technology Issues

Users in some districts experienced technology issues during the think-aloud observations or reported such issues during focus groups. These are issues that are likely not controllable by ESE or Thinkgate, but that nonetheless serve as a barrier to ET&L use.

The three issues voiced during focus groups were all related to assessment administration. Focus group participants in two districts noted that they do not have sufficient hardware to administer assessments to students online, which means that they cannot access the potential benefits of online assessment (e.g., immediate results and reporting, less time spent scanning or entering data). Members of a coach focus group at one of these districts reported a related challenge: They frequently have difficulty with their scanner, so they must input students’ assessment answers manually. Finally, a focus group at a school in another district talked about bandwidth issues, especially when administering assessments with speaking and listening items, which have embedded videos.

Bandwidth issues likely also play a role in slow system loading times. Long loading time was observed to be a persistent and pervasive issue related to ET&L use. During the think-aloud observations, delays in accessing the ET&L site and navigating between tabs within the ET&L system were observed 17 times and occurred during 14 of the 26 ET&L think-aloud observations. In most of these cases, loading took between 30 seconds and one minute. However, in a few cases, the site took several minutes to display a page or a report. Many of the participants expressed frustration with the slowness of the system—even if their district’s own server might be contributing to the problem. Some reported that loading times were improved when they worked remotely using WiFi, and others reported that loading times were improved when connected to their district servers directly.

### Edwin Analytics Benefits and Challenges

Relatively few of our think-aloud observation or focus-group participants—who were selected because of their ET&L use—were Edwin Analytics users. Nonetheless, those who were users provided some information about factors that facilitate and inhibit their use of the system.

Of the nine think-aloud observation participants who were Edwin Analytics users, six noted that they experienced few or no issues when using Analytics—and some remarked that it was very easy and straightforward to use. However, three of these users were observed as experiencing only partial or no success when executing desired Analytics tasks. These issues were related to system access and navigation. Two of the nine think-aloud observation participants experienced access issues in trying to enter the Edwin Analytics site.

Five users experienced difficulty with site navigation. Two Analytics users reported that they simply lacked information or proficiency in fully utilizing all of its capabilities. Several Analytics users seemed to be aware that Analytics contained additional features such as “the cube” and “EWIS,” but they had only used Analytics to examine MCAS and student growth information. Others wanted greater access to classroom results and training to better understand where to find new information or how to use the Edwin Analytics system more fully.

In contrast to the findings from think-aloud observations, survey responses indicated that there are no major barriers to using Edwin Analytics for most respondents (Figure 25). About two thirds or more selected the option *minimally* or *not at all* when presented with potential barriers to use. Slightly more than one third of respondents reported that usability issues, lack of sufficient training, lack of sufficient time, and the timeliness of data availability *moderately* or *extensively* represented barriers to use*.*

Figure 25. Degree to Which Respondents Indicated the Following Statements Represented a Barrier to Using Edwin Analytics (*N* = 119–134)

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

*Note*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

Overall, these data indicate that Analytics users are skilled at the tasks they do regularly and find the system straightforward for those tasks. They do not readily perceive barriers to use; however, think-aloud observation data suggest that users may have limitations in using the system for new or unfamiliar tasks.

## EQ5. What policies and procedures should be in place to help ensure the successful and sustainable implementation of both Edwin systems and of their integrated use?

This section examines our final EQ, addressing the sustainability of the two Edwin systems. We focus here primarily on findings about districts’ and educators’ decisions to use each system; our analyses of policies and procedures to further encourage their use are presented in the subsequent Discussion and Recommendations section. Overall, ET&L adoption rates are low, even among districts that agreed to use the system in the 2014–15 school year. District administrators cited competing systems and lack of information about ongoing costs as the primary reasons for nonadoption. School respondents also indicated a lack of training and support to use it. Analytics use, on the other hand, was high among administrators with access to it, and they reported feeling well supported to use it.

### ET&L Implementation

Adoption and use of ET&L has been low, even though they system has been offered free of cost to all districts through the end of the 2014‒15 school year. As previously noted, according to usage data provided by the vendor, 85 districts have committed to using ET&L during the 2014‒15 school year and have uploaded their data.[[22]](#footnote-22) Of these, 82 are RTTT districts, out of a total 228 RTTT districts in the state, for an RTTT district execution rate of just more than one third (36 percent).[[23]](#footnote-23) Even fewer of these districts (26 percent) have a least one user who has logged into ET&L since July 2014.

We came across this low-use phenomenon directly in our sample of district administrators. We initially sampled 19 district administrators from districts that had sent a letter to ESE by June 2014, committing to use ET&L in the 2014‒15 school year. However, when we conducted our interviews in fall 2014, we found that only five of these districts were planning to implement the system. Another 13 planned not to do so, and administrators in four districts said they were not yet sure. Respondents in 12 districts indicated reasons for their decision not to adopt Edwin T&L, including the following:

* Determination that ET&L system capabilities are not better than what is already in place in the district (*n* = 6)
* Ongoing concern about long-term cost, which at the time had not yet been communicated to districts (*n* = 3)
* Training time commitment (*n* = 2)
* Perception that the system was not yet fully functional (*n* = 2)
* Lack of SIF operationalization in the district (*n* = 1)
* Difficulty transferring existing data into ET&L (*n* = 1)
* Lack of connection between ET&L and Analytics (*n* = 1), which had been planned to operate from a single platform, but as of now do not
* Concern about Thinkgate’s ability to support statewide implementation of the system given districts’ experiences up until that point (*n* = 1)

The most prevalent reason given for nonadoption, that ET&L capabilities are not superior to competing systems, runs contrary to a primary State purpose for offering ET&L, namely the expectation that it could replace a range of other software packages. In Phase 1 of the evaluation, we performed an analysis of competing software packages used in pilot districts, suggesting that none of them alone have the same range of potential capabilities as ET&L (see *Edwin Evaluation Phase 1 Report* [Nov. 2013]). However, we also reported that these software packages have the advantage of incumbent status; educators are used to them and know how to use them. Indeed, district administrator respondents in the most recent round of interviews indicated that they are reluctant to switch from systems that teachers already know and feel comfortable with, nor do they want to risk losing historical data housed in these systems, and they do not want to bear the costs of importing the existing data into ET&L.

Cost is also an issue. At the time of the administrator interviews in summer 2014, participants expressed concern about not knowing the ongoing cost of ET&L after RTTT funding ended. ESE was able to make ET&L cost data available to districts starting in fall 2014. We included an item in the November 2014 ET&L administrator survey asking respondents to rate their agreement with this statement: ET&L is worth the investment of $2.50–$6.00 per pupil.A striking finding about the sustainability of the system when districts must pay for it themselves is that only 19 percent of administrators respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

School-based educators also shared their perceptions about barriers to ET&L adoption. Lack of sufficient training and administrative support for using ET&L were two additional barriers that think-aloud observation and focus-group participants discussed. We addressed training in EQ2, but it is worth noting that participants in two coach focus groups and seven teacher focus groups said that insufficient training posed a challenge for educators widely adopting ET&L.

Survey results also point to a lack of support for ET&L users. Only one half of administrators and one third of teachers reported that their use of ET&L was moderately or extensively supported by school leaders encouraging it (Figure 26). Similar proportions of respondents reported that a person in their school or district supported their use of ET&L moderately or extensively. Teachers and administrators rarely reported that school leaders support their use of ET&L by providing time to use the system.

Figure 26. Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Various Moderately or Extensively Supporting Factors of Their Use of ET&L

*Source:* ET&L Teacher and Administrator Surveys

*Note*: *N* ranges are reported because *N*s vary by item; each item was its own question in the survey and had differing response rates.

### Edwin Analytics Implementation

In contrast to ET&L, Edwin Analytics is widely used, and for the most part participants in district and school administrator interviews and focus groups seemed satisfied with the data they can get from Edwin Analytics and how the system works. In the Analytics user survey, more than three fourths of respondents (78 percent) reported that Edwin Analytics meets their data analysis needs (Table 16) *moderately* or *extensively*. This suggests that users are satisfied with the system as they are using it now.

Table 16. Extent to Which Edwin Analytics Met Respondents’ Data Analysis Needs (*N* = 135)

| **To what extent does Edwin Analytics meet your data analysis needs?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Not at all | 2.2% |
| Minimally | 20.0% |
| Moderately | 54.8% |
| Extensively | 23.0% |

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

Also in contrast to ET&L, Edwin Analytics survey respondents indicated that they receive support for their use of the system (Figure 27). At least two fifths of respondents reported being *moderately* or *extensively* supported by school and district leaders providing time for use of Edwin Analytics, school and district leaders encouraging collaboration with other staff members on the use of Edwin Analytics, and school and district leaders encouraging staff to use Edwin Analytics to help in decreasing achievement gaps. Slightly fewer respondents (24 percent) reported being *moderately* or *extensively* supported by school and district leaders providing ongoing training for use of Edwin Analytics, possibly suggesting ongoing training was either not effective or not valuable to Analytics users.

Figure 27. Factors Supporting Use of Edwin Analytics (*N* = 135)

*Source:* Edwin Analytics Survey

Interviews with district administrators, however, suggest that districts have not been quick to give teachers access to the system, which is now an option. One reason for this is that they must designate each user’s access type individually, a long process in large or even moderately large districts. Furthermore, three of the district administrators expressed concern that the system would be too complicated to expect teachers to use.

# Discussion and Recommendations

This section discusses emergent themes and implications of the findings presented in the previous sections and offers recommendations for moving forward. The discussion is organized by system.

## Finding Implications, Recommendations, and Next Steps for ET&L

The most striking aspect of our findings about ET&L is the very low usage rate. Only 85 districts have active user accounts as of July 2014, and of these districts, fewer than 75 percent have users who have logged into the system. User responses to the system were mixed but not strongly unfavorable. Many of the evaluation participants liked aspects of ET&L, including its assessment and reporting features. In the assessment tool, users particularly favored its incorporation of Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and Common Core State Standards, and the way items are both linked to the standards and tagged for difficulty level. In the reporting feature, users liked the distracter analysis. Survey respondents also reacted favorably to the inclusion of digital content in the system.

Nonetheless, less than one fifth of district- and school-level administrators indicated in a survey that ET&L was worth the cost per student. We found that most district and school administrators do not appear to perceive ET&L as a viable replacement for their other assessment and instruction systems, one of the State’s goals for the system as a whole. Several themes emerged over the course of the evaluation that reveal barriers to ET&L adoption. These themes include issues with communication, challenges with training, and challenges with the system itself. We next discuss how these barriers are manifested at the state, district, and system or user levels, and provide recommendations to address these barriers.

### **State-Level Barriers**

Overall, there was insufficient communication about ET&L’s capabilities, purpose, and cost. For example, communication from the ET&L vendor (e.g., during trainings) might have better emphasized the comprehensive nature of ET&L and its other features besides assessment. More importantly, however, would have been a more uniform message from ESE as a whole, with other departments emphasizing how ET&L supports other State education initiatives, including other RTTT-funded initiatives. For example, State trainings about curriculum mapping or teacher evaluation could demonstrate how ET&L can be used to accomplish district goals in these areas.

Delays in SIF operability, a key component for (near) real-time data transfer between districts, the State, and ET&L, also posed a challenge. Because the real-time data are a key feature of the system, not having that feature in place served as a barrier to adoption for districts that wanted to show teachers their own student data. Issues with SIF further delayed the rollout of the system, leading districts to perceive ET&L as an incomplete system.

### **District-Level Barriers**

At the district level, there were challenges with training users. The ET&L vendor employed a TTT model, which can be an effective method for reaching a large number of districts systematically. The ET&L vendor also showed good responsiveness to districts’ complaint about the time commitment of the TTTs, redesigning them completely as virtual trainings. A benefit of the virtual training plan was the use of Thinkgate University, which serves as an important resource for all ET&L users and ensures that all users have access to a systematic, albeit basic, level of training.[[24]](#footnote-24)

However, Thinkgate University cannot replace training or coaching for most users, and training has not occurred on a large scale within districts. The lack of widespread training may be occurring for several reasons. First, though ESE and Thinkgate provided a substantial supply of resources for districts to use in providing their own trainings, the TTTs did not sufficiently address rollout planning, so districts that did not have an implementation plan before they participated in the TTTs did not have opportunities or supports for building one. Training in ET&L is a substantial endeavor, requiring advanced planning and prioritization, something that was not discussed in the TTTs. Second, because the TTTs heavily emphasized the assessment component of ET&L, many participants did not feel adequately prepared to share the entire system with others. Finally, the slower than planned pace of the rollout likely reduced the likelihood of district retrainings. Many pilot districts wanted to wait until the system was fully functional before conducting trainings, but by the time this occurred their original ET&L points of contact had taken other positions, creating a gap in district ET&L knowledge.

### **System- or User-Level Barriers**

The ET&L system itself has posed barriers to users, which may have led districts to hesitate to introduce it to their teachers. The system was not sufficiently intuitive for users to use it without training and practice, a process that required a relatively substantial time commitment. Most functions within ET&L are complex, with many steps (the exception to this is the “Make it Quick” assessment, a popular feature among users). Help resources about specific issues could be hard to find within the system. Combined with technical issues within districts (e.g., lack of appropriate hardware, bandwidth issues), evaluation participants expressed frustration with using ET&L.

### **Recommendations**

Several of the challenges described here arose for reasons beyond the ESE ET&L team’s control. For example, the limited RTTT funding period drove the State to introduce ET&L before it was fully functional. Some issues with SIF occurred within a different ESE department, and some occurred within districts. Technology issues within districts were also beyond the State’s control. Finally, the cost of the system is dependent on how many districts use it, so the State was unable to publish the cost initially. However, there are some actions that the ESE ET&L team could have taken, and still can take, that might mitigate these issues moving forward:

* Better communication about ET&L capabilities to districts and more comprehensive training on its other functions.
* A more cohesive message from ESE about ET&L and how it can support other State initiatives.
* Better communication with districts and ongoing updates about the cost of the system, even if the exact projected cost was unknown. Ideally, districts would have recognized the importance of joining with other districts to adopt ET&L and drive down the cost statewide.
* More cohesive training and support for district implementation plans.

Going forward, we recommend taking the following actions to increase rates of ET&L adoption and implementation:

* Continue to provide a variety of opportunities for educators to learn about the system.
* Develop and perpetuate an ESE-wide message about ET&L and how it supports educators’ work, especially with regards to other State initiatives.
* Expand the TTT to include more comprehensive information about all of the ET&L features, as well as information to support district implementation plans.
* Update the list of district ET&L contacts and verify that they still hold positions within their districts that allow them to advocate for and provide training for ET&L. For districts with gaps, consider providing another round of TTTs.
* Identify and support ET&L “champions” in districts and schools—those educators who make good use of the system. Provide opportunities for them to share their ideas and practices (ESE has begun this process through educator panels at Roadshows; the recommendation is to continue and expand this practice).
* Encourage Thinkgate to address the system issues outlined in Table 15. Communicate with districts about the changes, and provide widespread information, perhaps as an FAQ document, about any issues that are outside of state control (e.g., district-controlled SIF issues).
* Provide feedback to Thinkgate and encourage them to update the ET&L user interface to be more intuitive, with larger, easier-to-interpret icons.
* Provide feedback to Thinkgate to update the search function in the ET&L Reference Center to search within documents. Add tables of contents to Reference Center documents to assist users with finding information about specific tasks.

Edwin Analytics

Analytics users are largely satisfied with the system as it is. ESE has provided ongoing updates, with new data and reports, and most users agree that it is much improved since it was the Education Data Warehouse. Although users may experience difficulty accessing new reports and data, most are comfortable retrieving the data they need. At this point, most users are administrators, despite the fact that the State provides districts the option to provide access to teachers.

Our only recommendation for Edwin Analytics is to consider developing a more systematic training plan as it is offered to an increasing number of users throughout the state. New users, especially those who do not usually serve a data analysis role in their district, may have difficulty making full use of the system without assistance. Districts may be more comfortable providing access to teachers if there are additional opportunities for training.

# Appendix A. Edwin Evaluation Interim Report Descriptions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | *Edwin Evaluation Phase 1 Report* |
| **Authors** | Erin Haynes, John Meakin, Jonathan Margolin, Charleen Wilder, and Rebecca Flynn |
| **Time Frame** | July–August 2013 |
| **Date Submitted** | September 2013 |
| **Data Sources** | |
| * Semistructured phone interviews with three of ESE’s executive sponsors for the Edwin systems * Two semi-structured phone interviews with Edwin Teaching and Learning (ET&L) State leaders at both ESE and the Massachusetts Executive Office of Education * Semi-structured phone interviews with two lead trainers for ET&L and one lead trainer for Edwin Analytics * Semi-structured phone interviews with administrators from 13 of the 34 ET&L pilot districts * Edwin Analytics system usage data for 2,831 users in 383 districts; data disaggregated monthly | |
| **Summary** | |
| This report provided information about ET&L pilot districts’ initial use and experiences with the system. Collected data also informed the evaluation data collection instruments, including surveys, training observation protocols, protocols for observations of educators’ use of both Edwin systems, and educator focus group protocols. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | *Edwin Evaluation Phase 2 Report* |
| **Authors** | Charleen Wilder, John Meakin, Julia Casasanto-Ferro, Erin Haynes, and Jonathan Margolin |
| **Time Frame** | September–October 2013 |
| **Date Submitted** | October 2013 |
| **Data Sources** | |
| * Observations of six ET&L trainings in four districts * Edwin Analytics system usage data for 4,486 unique users in 408 districts; data disaggregated weekly | |
| **Summary** | |
| This report focused primarily on ET&L trainings provided to districts by administrators who had received State ET&L Train the Trainer (TTT) trainings. We examined how the trainings were delivered, which topics were covered, challenges the district trainers or participants encountered, and how they addressed these challenges. We also extended our Edwin Analytics usage findings from the Phase 1 report. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | *Evaluation of the Pilot and Implementation of Edwin: Technical Data Collection Report 3* |
| **Authors** | Julia Casasanto-Ferro, Jared Eno, Charleen Wilder, John Meakin, Erin Haynes, and Jonathan Margolin |
| **Name** | *Evaluation of the Pilot and Implementation of Edwin: Evaluation Memo 3* |
| **Authors** | Erin Haynes and Jonathan Margolin |
| **Time Frame** | November 2013–February 2014 |
| **Date Submitted** | April 2014 |
| **Data Sources** | |
| * Observations of State ET&L TTTs for two cohorts of 10 districts each (Cohorts 2 and 3) * Reviews of nine of 15 administrator Web training modules and six of 15 teacher Web training modules * Survey of State ET&L TTT participants (23 respondents) * Surveys of ET&L and Edwin Analytics users   + ET&L teacher survey: 200 randomly sampled educators with teacher-level access who had been trained on the system were invited to participate; 121 (60.5 percent) completed the survey   + ET&L administrator survey: 52 educators with administrator-level access who had been trained on the system were invited to participate; 29 (55.8 percent) completed the survey * Edwin Analytics survey: 400 randomly sampled educators with access to Edwin Analytics were invited to participate; 159 (39.8 percent) completed the survey | |
| **Summary** | |
| This technical data collection report and associated evaluation memo examined educators’ use and experiences with both Edwin systems through surveys of users, as well as educators’ experiences with the new remote State ET&L TTTs. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | *Evaluation of the Pilot and Implementation of Edwin: Technical Data Collection Report 4* |
| **Authors** | John Meakin, Erin Haynes, and Jonathan Margolin |
| **Time Frame** | June 2013–June 2014 |
| **Date Submitted** | October 2014 |
| **Data Source** | |
| Edwin Analytics system usage data for 6,154 unique users in 421 districts; data disaggregated weekly | |
| **Summary** | |
| This report examined Edwin Analytics usage over the course of the previous year, including types of reports favored by high- and low-frequency users, and annual spikes in system usage. | |

# Appendix B. District Training Observation Protocol

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Date:*** |  | ***Observer:*** |  |
| ***District:*** |  | ***Instructor Name(s):*** |  |
| ***Observation Start:*** |  | ***Observation End:*** |  |

**I. Context**

*Directions: Describe the participants and setting during the first 5 minutes of the observation.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Participants*** |
| *Note who is participating in the training*   * *number of participants* * *participants’ roles in the district* |
|  |
| ***Setting*** |
| *Describe where the training is taking place (e.g., online, face-to-face in a computer lab, face-to-face in a classroom)* |
|  |

**II. Description**

*Directions: Describe what is happening during the course. Note all of the topics covered and the allocation of time to various types of activities. Every* ***15–20 minutes****, switch to a new page.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** |
| ***Trainer presenting*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Small-group work/ discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Individual work/ one-on-one consultations*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Large-group discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Practice using Edwin T&L*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** |
| ***Trainer presenting*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Small-group work/ discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Individual work/ one-on-one consultations*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Large-group discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Practice using Edwin T&L*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** |
| ***Trainer Presenting*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Small-group work/ discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Individual work/ one-on-one consultations*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Large group discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Practice using Edwin T&L*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** |
| ***Trainer presenting*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Small-group work/ discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Individual work/ one-on-one consultations*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Large-group discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Practice using Edwin T&L*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** |
| ***Trainer presenting*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Small-group work/ discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Individual work/ one-on-one consultations*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Large-group discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Practice using Edwin T&L*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** | **Start** | **End** |
| ***Trainer presenting*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Small-group work/ discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Individual work/ one-on-one consultations*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Large-group discussions*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Practice using Edwin T&L*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**III. Observations**

*Directions: After the observation, use your descriptions to answer the following questions.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***1. The trainer appears comfortable delivering the training.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *actions/speech that indicate trainer’s comfort*   *If no, note:*   * *actions/speech that indicate trainer’s discomfort* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2. The trainer has the tools and materials necessary to deliver the training.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *tools and materials the trainer uses*   *If no, note:*   * *tools and materials that would be helpful* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***3. The trainer articulates the State’s goals for the rollout of Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *method for articulating the goals (i.e., PowerPoint slides, handouts, discussion)* * *goals that the trainer articulates* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***4. The trainer articulates the district’s goals for the adoption of Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *method for articulating the goals (i.e., PowerPoint slides, handouts, discussion)* * *goals that the trainer articulates* * *any discussion of how the district goals for Edwin relate to State goals for Edwin* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***5. The trainer articulates how Edwin T&L fits into existing district education goals.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *method and content of discussion* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***6. The trainer discusses the district’s expectations for how participants will use Edwin T&L in their educational contexts.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *method and content of discussion* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***7. Trainer discusses how Edwin Analytics can be used in conjunction with Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *what the trainer says about using both systems* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***8. Trainer discusses how Edwin T&L can be used to address achievement gaps in student achievement (e.g., tools for differentiating instruction, disaggregated student data, assessment).*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *what the trainer says about achievement gaps* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***9. Trainer effectively addresses participant questions about or difficulties with Edwin T&L, including logistical or technical problems.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *questions that were asked/problems encountered* * *responses from the trainer* * *reaction to response from the participants (e.g., nodding head, look of confusion, follow-up question)* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***10. Participants practice using features of Edwin T&L during the training.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *which features they practiced using* * *reactions from participants to the system (e.g., statements or body language that indicate excitement, confusion, frustration, etc.)* * *what guidance is provided by trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***11. Participants discuss aspects of Edwin T&L that they think will be most useful to them in their educational contexts.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *aspects they discuss and why they find them useful* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| ***12. Other notes*** |
|  |

# Appendix C. Training of Trainers Observation Protocol

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Part 1. Orientation Meeting** | Conference Call/Webinar |
| **Part 2. Web Modules** | Self-Paced |
| **Part 3. Check-In Meeting** | Conference Call/Webinar |
| **Part 4. Check-In Meeting** | Conference Call/Webinar |
| **Part 5. Conclusion Meeting** | Conference Call/Webinar |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 1. Orientation Meeting** | | | |
| **Date:** |  | **Observer:** |  |
| **Session:** |  | **Observation start time:** |  |
| **Instructor:** |  | **Observation end time:** |  |

**I. Context**

*Directions: Describe the participants and setting during the first 5 minutes of the observation.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Participants*** |
| *If possible, note who is participating in the training:*   * *number of participants* * *participants’ roles in their districts* |
|  |
| ***Setting*** |
| *Describe how the webinar is conducted and “rules” for the training, if noted (e.g., raising hands, accessibility, phone and Web connections, etc.).* |
|  |

**II. Description**

*Directions: Describe what is happening during the webinar. Note all of the topics covered and whether and how trainees participate. Every* ***15–20 minutes****, switch to a new page.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

**III. Observations**

*Directions: After the observation, use your descriptions to answer the following questions.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***1. The trainer articulates the state’s goals for the rollout of Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *goals that the trainer articulates* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2. The trainer discusses expectations for how districts will implement Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *expectations that the trainer articulates* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***3. Participants discuss districts’ goals for the adoption of Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *goals that participants discuss* * *any discussion of how the district goals for Edwin relate to state goals for Edwin* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***4. The trainer leads a discussion about participants’ expectations for how educators in their districts will use Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *expectations that participants discuss* * *any discussion of how the district expectations for Edwin relate to state expectations for Edwin* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***5. Participants ask about how Edwin Analytics can be used in conjunction with Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *participants’ questions* * *the trainer’s response(s)* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***6. The trainer discusses how Edwin T&L can be used to address achievement gaps in student achievement (e.g., tools for differentiating instruction, disaggregated student data, assessment).*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *what the trainer says about achievement gaps* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***7. Participants discuss aspects of Edwin T&L that they think will be most useful to them in their educational contexts.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *aspects they discuss and why they find them useful* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***8. Participants discuss potential challenges or barriers to using Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *aspects they discuss and why they find them challenging* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| ***9. Other notes*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 2. Web Modules** | | | |
| **Date:** |  | **Observer:** |  |

**I. Topics**

*Directions: List the required and optional topics that are covered by the Web modules.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Required Topics*** |
|  |
| ***Optional Topics*** |
|  |

**II. Description**

*Directions: Click through the modules and describe each of the following aspects.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***1. Navigability of Website*** |
| *Note how easy it is to navigate the website and any difficulties encountered.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***2. Navigability of Modules*** |
| *Note how easy it is to navigate the modules and any difficulties encountered.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***3. Clarity of Instruction*** |
| *Note any barriers to understanding the instruction in the modules.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***4. Technical Issues*** |
| *Note any technical problems in the website or modules.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***5. Availability of Technical Help*** |
| *Note how easy it is to obtain technical help and the form of the assistance (e.g., chat, document, phone call).* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***6. Availability of Content Help*** |
| *Note how easy it is to obtain help with the content and the form of the assistance (e.g., chat, document, phone call).* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***7. Collaboration*** |
| *Note any opportunities for participants to collaborate with each other.* |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***8. Other notes*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 3. Check-In Meeting** | | | |
| **Date:** |  | **Observer:** |  |
| **Session:** |  | **Observation start time:** |  |
| **Instructor:** |  | **Observation end time:** |  |

**I. Context**

*Directions: Describe the participants and setting during the first 5 minutes of the observation.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Participants*** |
| *If possible, note who is participating in the check-in:*   * *number of participants* * *anyone who is missing from the orientation meeting* |
|  |
| ***Setting*** |
| *Describe how the webinar is conducted and “rules” for the training, if noted (e.g., raising hands, accessibility, phone and Web connections, etc.). Note any changes since the orientation meeting.* |
|  |

**II. Description**

*Directions: Describe what is happening during the webinar. Note all of the topics covered and whether and how trainees participate. Every* ***15–20 minutes****, switch to a new page.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

**III. Observations**

*Directions: After the observation, use your descriptions to answer the following questions.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***1. Participants discuss district’s goals for the adoption of Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *goals that participants discuss* * *any discussion of how the district goals for Edwin relate to State goals for Edwin* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2. The trainer leads a discussion about participants’ expectations for how educators in their districts will use Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *expectations that participants discuss* * *any discussion of how the district expectations for Edwin relate to State expectations for Edwin* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***3. Participants ask about how Edwin Analytics can be used in conjunction with Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *participants’ questions* * *the trainer’s response(s)* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***4. The trainer discusses how Edwin T&L can be used to address achievement gaps in student achievement (e.g., tools for differentiating instruction, disaggregated student data, assessment).*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *what the trainer says about achievement gaps* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***5. Participants discuss aspects of Edwin T&L that they think will be most useful to them in their educational contexts.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *aspects they discuss and why they find them useful* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***6. Participants discuss potential challenges or barriers to using Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *aspects they discuss and why they find them challenging* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***7. Trainers effectively address participant questions about or difficulties with Edwin T&L, including logistical or technical problems.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *questions that were asked/problems encountered* * *responses from the trainer* * *reaction to response from the participants (e.g., follow-up question)* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***8. The trainer leads a discussion about training other educators how to use Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *questions that were asked/problems encountered* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| ***9. Other notes*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 4. Check-In Meeting** | | | |
| **Date:** |  | **Observer:** |  |
| **Session:** |  | **Observation start time:** |  |
| **Instructor:** |  | **Observation end time:** |  |

**I. Context**

*Directions: Describe the participants and setting during the first 5 minutes of the observation.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Participants*** |
| *If possible, note who is participating in the check-in:*   * *number of participants* * *anyone who is missing from previous meetings* |
|  |
| ***Setting*** |
| *Describe how the webinar is conducted and “rules” for the training, if noted (e.g., raising hands, accessibility, phone and Web connections, etc.). Note any changes since previous meetings.* |
|  |

**II. Description**

*Directions: Describe what is happening during the webinar. Note all of the topics covered and whether and how trainees participate. Every* ***15–20 minutes****, switch to a new page.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

**III. Observations**

*Directions: After the observation, use your descriptions to answer the following questions.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***1. Participants ask about how Edwin Analytics can be used in conjunction with Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *participants’ questions* * *the trainer’s response(s)* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2. The trainer discusses how Edwin T&L can be used to address achievement gaps in student achievement (e.g., tools for differentiating instruction, disaggregated student data, assessment).*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *what the trainer says about achievement gaps* * *any reactions/discussion/pushback from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***3. Participants discuss aspects of Edwin T&L that they think will be most useful to them in their educational contexts.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *aspects they discuss and why they find them useful* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***4. Participants discuss potential challenges or barriers to using Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *aspects they discuss and why they find them challenging* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***5. Trainers effectively address participant questions about or difficulties with Edwin T&L, including logistical or technical problems.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *questions that were asked/problems encountered* * *responses from the trainer* * *reaction to response from the participants (e.g., follow-up question)* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***6. The trainer leads a discussion about training other educators how to use Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *questions that were asked/problems encountered* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***7. Trainers provide information about where to get materials and support for district trainings.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *types of materials and support available* * *reactions from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***8. Participants discuss plans for training other educators in their districts.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *plans that participants discuss* * *any feedback from the trainers or other districts* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| ***9. Other notes*** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 5. Conclusion Meeting** | | | |
| **Date:** |  | **Observer:** |  |
| **Session:** |  | **Observation start time:** |  |
| **Instructor:** |  | **Observation end time:** |  |

**I. Context**

*Directions: Describe the participants and setting during the first 5 minutes of the observation.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Participants*** |
| *If possible, note who is participating in the check-in:*   * *number of participants* * *anyone who is missing from previous meetings* |
|  |
| ***Setting*** |
| *Describe how the webinar is conducted and “rules” for the training, if noted (e.g., raising hands, accessibility, phone and web connections, etc.) Note any changes since previous meetings.* |
|  |

**II. Description**

*Directions: Describe what is happening during the webinar. Note all of the topics covered and whether and how trainees participate. Every* ***15-20 minutes****, switch to a new page.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Description*** |
|  |
| ***Topics*** |
|  |

**III. Observations**

*Directions: After the observation, use your descriptions to answer the following questions.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***1. Participants have an opportunity to ask remaining questions about Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *questions that were asked/problems encountered* * *responses from the trainer* * *reaction to response from the participants (e.g., follow-up question)* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2. Participants receive information about where they can get help after the training.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *type of help offered* * *reactions from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***3. Participants discuss aspects of Edwin T&L that they think will be most useful to them in their educational contexts.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *aspects they discuss and why they find them useful* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***4. Participants discuss potential challenges or barriers to using Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *aspects they discuss and why they find them challenging* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***5. The trainer leads a discussion about training other educators how to use Edwin T&L.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *questions that were asked/problems encountered* * *responses from the trainer* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***6. The trainer provides information about where to get materials and support for district trainings.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *types of materials and support available* * *reactions from participants* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***7. Participants discuss plans for training other educators in their districts.*** | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
| *If yes, note:*   * *plans that participants discuss* * *any feedback from the trainers or other districts* | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| ***8. Other notes*** |
|  |

# Appendix D. District Leader Interview Protocols

I. District Leader Interview Protocol: Adopters

Hello, my name is *[your name]*, and this is *[your cofacilitator/note taker’s name]*. Thanks again for taking the time to speak with me this morning/afternoon. Before we start, I’d like to provide a little background on our work, and answer any questions you might have for me.

I work for American Institutes for Research/Evidence-Based Education Research & Evaluation

(EBERE). We are working on a project for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to learn more about how districts are using the Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics systems. This information will help inform any possible changes to the systems and trainings for the systems to make them more useful to Massachusetts educators.

Before we begin, there are a few things I would like to discuss with you. First, we will keep everything you tell us confidential. This means we will never use your name or say that you said anything when we report our findings. Please be assured that we will not repeat anything you say today to anyone other than our research team who is responsible for analyzing the data and writing a report about our findings.

Second, there are no right or wrong answers; we are seeking what you know to be facts, and we are also seeking your opinions, so share with us to the best of your ability. We would like to learn as much as we can about both Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics, so we will ask you questions about both. I realize you may be more familiar with just one of the systems, but let me know whatever you can about each of them. **Recently the Department rebranded the Education Data Warehouse, and it is now known as Edwin Analytics. Edwin Analytics includes Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) reports, Early Warning Indicator System reports, and Postsecondary Reports**.

Because we would like to capture all of the information you provide in a coherent way, we would like your permission to record the interview so that we capture all the information verbatim. This recording will be shared only with the research team, will be stored in a secure server, and will be destroyed after the study. If there is anything you will like to have off the record, please let us know, and we will not record it. Is it okay to move forward with recording the discussion?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

|  |
| --- |
| ***Note to interviewer****: Throughout the interview, be sure to distinguish between Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics. If you are unsure about which system the interviewee is referring to, be sure to clarify.* |

**Background/Context** (*Spend minimal time on this section*)

1. Can you please describe your role in the district?
2. In your role as \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, what has been your involvement with the rollout of ET&L in your district?
3. Who uses Edwin Analytics in your district?

*Probe: Are any teachers using it yet?*

**Goals and Expectations for the Edwin Systems**

***ET&L***

1. How does ET&L fit into your district’s goals?

*Probe: How are these goals communicated to schools/teachers?*

1. What are your district’s expectations for how ET&L is used by administrators and teachers? Have these expectations changed?

*Probe: Do any of these expectations relate to addressing achievement gaps?*

*Probe: How has your district communicated these expectations to school officials and teachers?*

*Probe: Is current implementation meeting these expectations?*

1. In your opinion, how well are school leaders communicating with their staff and guiding the use of ET&L in their buildings?

*Probe: For example, setting expectations for use, providing time, leading by example*

***Analytics***

1. How does Edwin Analytics fit into your district’s goals?

*Probe: How are these goals communicated to schools/teachers?*

1. What are your district’s expectations for how Edwin Analytics is used by administrators? If you are giving teachers access, what are your expectations for how they will use Edwin Analytics?

*Probe: Do any of these expectations relate to addressing achievement gaps?*

*Probe: How has your district communicated these expectations to school officials and teachers?*

*Probe: Is current implementation meeting these expectations?*

1. In your opinion, how well are school leaders communicating with their staff and guiding the use of Analytics in their buildings?

*Probe: For example, setting expectations for use, providing time, leading by example*

**Use of Data Systems and Technology**

***ET&L***

1. Is your district using any curriculum planning systems besides ET&L?
2. Is your district using any computer-based assessment systems besides ET&L?

***Analytics***

1. Is your district using any other data systems besides Analytics?

*If yes, probe for which ones and how widely they are still used.*

*Probe for how the Edwin systems compare with other systems.*

1. Do the same people in the district use both ET&L and Analytics?
2. Do they use the systems in conjunction with each other or entirely separately (i.e., do they integrate the use or do they use each for different purposes and at different times)?

**Training**

***ET&L***

1. Please describe the training the district provided for Edwin ET&L.

*Probe:*

* + *Whom did you train, and how were they selected?*
  + *Was the training mandatory?*
  + *Did the training you received from Thinkgate adequately prepare you to train others?*
  + *Did you encounter any barriers while training (e.g., technical issues, teacher resistance)?*
  + *Did you have the materials you needed to provide the training? The equipment? The support (from ESE, Thinkgate, and/or the district)?*

1. Based on how people are using ET&L, are there any training areas that should be added, modified, or further emphasized to better address staff needs for using the system?
2. What is the district’s plan for people who haven’t received ET&L training?

***Analytics***

1. Has anyone in the district received training for Edwin Analytics? Who provided the training?

*Probe:*

* + *Whom did you train, and how were they selected?*
  + *Who provided the training?*
  + *Was the training mandatory?*
  + *Did you encounter any barriers while training (e.g., technical issues, teacher resistance)?*
  + *Did you have the materials you needed to provide the training? The equipment? The support (from ESE and/or the district)?*

1. Based on how people are using Analytics, are there any training areas that should be added, modified, or further emphasized to better address staff needs for using the system?
2. What is the district’s plan for people who haven’t received Analytics training?

*Probe: Training teachers to use Analytics*

**Current Use and Monitoring of Edwin Systems**

1. Please describe the ways in which ET&L is currently used among staff in your district.

*Probe:*

* *Who is using it?*
* *Are they using it to inform instruction? Interventions/supports for students?*
* *Are they using it to inform strategies for closing the achievement gap for low-income and minority students, and second language learners?*

1. Please describe the ways in which Analytics is currently used among staff in your district.

*Probe:*

* *Who is using it?*
* *Are they using it to inform instruction? Interventions/supports for students?*
* *Are they using it to inform strategies for closing the achievement gap for low-income and minority students, and second language learners?*

1. What procedures, if any, are in place to monitor the use of the Edwin systems in the schools (e.g., are data being utilized as expected, are planned instructional responses effective)?

**Assessment of the Edwin Systems**

**Successes**

1. Tell us about some successes with the initial rollout of ET&L, if any, that really stand out for you.

*Probe: What do you think are the most helpful components of ET&L for district- and school-level staff?*

1. What successes have you encountered with Edwin Analytics at the district level? In individual schools?

*Probe: What do you think are the most helpful components of Analytics?*

**Helpful Components**

1. Which resources of ET&L do teachers use the most? Why?
2. What types of student data in Edwin Analytics do staff find the most useful?

**Challenges**

***ET&L***

1. What challenges have you encountered with the initial rollout of ET&L?

*Probe:*

* *Have teachers encountered any technical difficulties or barriers, such as access to computers or the Internet?*
* *Is there flexibility to allow teachers make changes in response to data, and to use the instructional resources in ET&L?*
* *How could the system be improved?*

1. How would you recommend improving ET&L?

***Analytics***

1. What challenges have you encountered with Edwin Analytics at the district level? In individual schools?

*Probe:*

* *Have teachers encountered any technical difficulties or barriers, such as access to computers or the Internet?*
* *Is there flexibility to allow teachers make changes in response to data, and to use the instructional resources in Analytics?*
* *How could the system be improved?*

1. How would you recommend improving Analytics?

**Support for Use of Edwin Systems**

***ET&L***

1. How do you get current information about ET&L?

*Probe: Is the information you get useful? What additional information would be useful?*

1. What types of support for ET&L are available to district staff and schools?

*Probe:*

* *Do schools in your district have a person who acts as a coordinator, facilitator, or coach to support ET&L use? In what way does this person provide support?*
* *Do schools in your district have an instructional support person who helps teachers find resources in the ET&L system?*
* *Do schools provide staff with scheduled meeting time to examine or discuss the resources in ET&L, and/or to collaborate on developing assessments or lesson plans in ET&L?*
* *In what ways are district staff supporting schools in their use of ET&L?*

***Analytics***

1. How do you get current information about Edwin Analytics?

*Probe: Is the information you get useful? What additional information would be useful?*

1. What types of support for use of Analytics are available to district staff and in the schools?

*Probe:*

* *Do schools in your district have a person who acts as a coordinator, facilitator, or coach to support data use? In what way does this person support data use?*
* *Do schools provide staff with scheduled meeting time to review Edwin data in the Analytics system? What in particular are the goals of these meetings? (Probe for focus on achievement gaps, differentiated instruction, etc.)*
* *How are district staff supporting schools in their use of Analytics?*

**Sustainability**

1. What plans are in place for the district to continue using ET&L when the grant period ends and it is no longer free to use?

II. District Leader Interview Protocol: Withdrawers

Hello, my name is *[your name]*, and this is *[your cofacilitator/note taker’s name]*. Thanks again for taking the time to speak with me this morning/afternoon. Before we start, I’d like to provide a little background on our work, and answer any questions you might have for me.

I work for American Institutes for Research/Evidence-Based Education Research & Evaluation (EBERE). We are working on a project for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to learn more about how districts are using the Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics systems. This information will help inform any possible changes to the systems and trainings for the systems to make them more useful to Massachusetts educators.

Before we begin, there are a few things I would like to discuss with you. First, we will keep everything you tell us confidential. This means we will never use your name or say that you said anything when we report our findings. Please be assured that we will not repeat anything you say today to anyone other than our research team who is responsible for analyzing the data and writing a report about our findings.

Second, there are no right or wrong answers; we are seeking what you know to be facts, and we are also seeking your opinions, so share with us to the best of your ability. We would like to learn as much as we can about both Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics, so we will ask you questions about both. I realize you may be more familiar with just one of the systems, but let me know whatever you can about each of them. **Recently the Department rebranded the Education Data Warehouse, and it is now known as Edwin Analytics. Edwin Analytics includes Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) reports, Early Warning Indicator System reports, and Postsecondary Reports**.

Because we would like to capture all of the information you provide in a coherent way, we would like your permission to record the interview so that we capture all the information verbatim. This recording will be shared only with the research team, will be stored in a secure server, and will be destroyed after the study. If there is anything you will like to have off the record, please let us know, and we will not record it. Is it okay to move forward with recording the discussion?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

|  |
| --- |
| ***Note to interviewer****: Throughout the interview, be sure to distinguish between Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics. If you are unsure about which system the interviewee is referring to, be sure to clarify.* |

**Background/Context** (*Spend minimal time on this section*)

1. Can you please describe your role in the district?

*[Omit if previously interviewed]*

1. In your role as \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, what has been your involvement with deciding whether or not to use ET&L in your district?
2. Who uses Edwin Analytics in your district?

*Probe: Are any teachers using it yet?*

**Decision Not To Use ET&L**

***ET&L***

1. How did the State communicate to you about ET&L? What did they communicate?

*Probe: Were the communications useful? How did the communications play into your decision about ET&L?*

1. What were your primary reasons for deciding not to use ET&L?

*Probe: Cost? Time? Whether it fit district needs for instruction?*

1. As it currently is, how could ET&L have fit into your district’s goals?

*Probe: In what ways could it have fit? In what ways would it not have fit?*

1. How could ET&L have been improved to better fit your district’s needs and goals?
2. Are you using any other similar systems instead of ET&L?   
   *If yes,* which one(s)?

**Analytics Goals and Expectations**

1. How does Edwin Analytics fit into your district’s goals?

*Probe: How are these goals communicated to schools/teachers?*

1. What are your district’s expectations for how Edwin Analytics is used by administrators? If you are giving teachers access, what are your expectations for how they will use Edwin Analytics?

*Probe: Do any of these expectations relate to addressing achievement gaps?*

*Probe: How has your district communicated these expectations to school officials and teachers?*

*Probe: Is current implementation meeting these expectations?*

1. In your opinion, how well are school leaders communicating with their staff and guiding the use of Analytics in their buildings?

*Probe: For example, setting expectations for use, providing time, leading by example*

**Use of Analytics**

1. Is your district using any other data systems besides Analytics?

*If yes, probe for which ones and how widely they are still used.*

*Probe for how the Edwin systems compare with other systems.*

1. Please describe the ways in which Analytics is currently used among staff in your district.

*Probe:*

* *Who is using it?*
* *Are they using it to inform instruction? Interventions/supports for students?*
* *Are they using it to inform strategies for closing the achievement gap for low-income and minority students, and second language learners?*

1. What procedures, if any, are in place to monitor the use of the Edwin systems in the schools (e.g., are data being utilized as expected, are planned instructional responses effective)?

**Training**

1. Has anyone in the district received training for Edwin Analytics? Who provided the training?

*Probe:*

* + *Whom did you train, and how were they selected?*
  + *Who provided the training?*
  + *Was the training mandatory?*
  + *Did you encounter any barriers while training (e.g., technical issues, teacher resistance)?*
  + *Did you have the materials you needed to provide the training? The equipment? The support (from ESE and/or the district)?*

1. Based on how people are using Analytics, are there any training areas that should be added, modified, or further emphasized to better address staff needs for using the system?
2. What is the district’s plan for people who haven’t received Analytics training?

*Probe: Training teachers to use Analytics*

**Assessment of Analytics**

1. How do you get current information about Edwin Analytics?

*Probe: Is the information you get useful? What additional information would be useful?*

1. What challenges have you encountered with Edwin Analytics at the district level? In individual schools?

*Probe:*

* *Have teachers encountered any technical difficulties or barriers, such as access to computers or the Internet?*
* *Is there flexibility to allow teachers make changes in response to data, and to use the instructional resources in Analytics?*
* *How could the system be improved?*

1. How would you recommend improving Edwin Analytics?
2. What types of support for use of Analytics are available to district staff and in the schools?

*Probe:*

* *Do schools in your district have a person who acts as a coordinator, facilitator, or coach to support data use? In what way does this person support data use?*
* *Do schools provide staff with scheduled meeting time to review Edwin data in the Analytics system? What in particular are the goals of these meetings? (Probe for focus on achievement gaps, differentiated instruction, etc.)*
* *How are district staff supporting schools in their use of Analytics?*

# Appendix E. ET&L and Analytics Surveys

I. ET&L Teacher Survey

This survey is part of an evaluation of the Edwin Teaching and Learning (ET&L) system. The evaluation will be used to improve the content and usability of the system. It is being conducted by American Institutes for Research on behalf of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE).

Your participation in the survey is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or to skip questions you do not wish to answer, without penalty. Your responses to this survey are completely confidential, and no personally identifiable data will be shared with your school, district, or ESE. Rather, your responses will be reported in aggregate to help ESE improve the content and usability of the ET&L platform. The survey should take approximately **20 minutes** to complete.

As a thank you for completing the survey, **a code for a $15 gift card for use online at Amazon.com was e-mailed to you with this survey invitation.**

Your answers and opinions are important to allow ESE to revise the ET&L system to make it more useful for educators. Thank you for your input!

*If you would like more information about this evaluation, you may contact the Project Director, Erin Haynes, at American Institutes for Research at 781-373-7017 or at* [*ehaynes@air.org*](mailto:ehaynes@air.org)*.*

**Background Information**

The first questions are about your background.

1. Which grade(s) do you teach? (Check all that apply.)

* Prekindergarten
* Kindergarten
* First
* Second
* Third
* Fourth
* Fifth
* Sixth
* Seventh
* Eighth
* Ninth
* Tenth
* Eleventh
* Twelfth
* Ages 18–22 students

1. How would you define your primary job role? (Choose one.)

* General Education Teacher
* Special Education Teacher
* English Language Learner (ELL) Teacher
* Dual Language Learner (DLL) Teacher
* English as a Second Language (ESL) Teacher
* Career Vocational and Technical Education (CVTE) Teacher
* Department Chair
* Specialist
* Principal
* Assistant Principal
* District Administrator
* Data Coach
* Academic Coach
* Technology Coach
* Instructional Leader
* Other role (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Purpose of ET&L**

1. To what extent are you aware of the state of Massachusetts’s purpose for adopting ET&L?

* Not at all aware
* Minimally aware
* Moderately aware
* Extremely aware

1. Which of the following do you believe are the state of Massachusetts’s major purposes for developing ET&L? (Check all that apply.)

* Facilitate the transition to the Common Core Standards
* Provide curriculum and assessment tools in a single system
* Provide access to use and customize the Model Curriculum Units
* Provide tools that help teachers assess student mastery of standards
* Provide timely and actionable information on students
* Provide tools and resources to support teaching and learning
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* I am not aware of the state’s purposes for developing ET&L.

1. To what extent has the district clearly communicated its purpose for adopting ET&L?

* Not at all
* Minimally
* Moderately
* Extensively

1. Which of the following are the major purposes of the **Student Assessment Tools** in ET&L as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)

* Creating and administering classroom assessments
* Developing common assessments
* Making it quicker/easier to view assessment results
* Facilitating alignment of test items with standards
* Identifying student understanding of different content areas
* Identifying areas for remediation, advanced work, or reteaching
* Tracking vocational/technical competencies
* Coordinating assessment and curriculum in one system
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* I am not aware of the district’s purposes for the Student Assessment Tools.

1. Which of the following are the major purposes of **Curriculum Tools** in ET&L as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)

* Aligning curriculum to state standards and Common Core standards
* Using and/or customizing the state Model Curriculum Units
* Strengthening core instruction (e.g., reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies)
* Synchronizing instruction across the district
* Providing instructional resources to teachers
* Coordinating curriculum and assessment in one system
* Facilitating differentiated instruction
* Facilitating lesson and unit planning with the Understanding by Design template
* Allowing teachers to share lesson plans/planning
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* I am not aware of the district’s purposes for the Curriculum Tools.

**District Encouragement of ET&L Use**

The next questions are about the ET&L components that your district has encouraged you to use.

1. Which components of ET&L **Student Assessment Tools** has your district encouraged teachers to use? (Check all that apply.)

* Assessment and Item Development Tools
* Assessment Administration (online, clicker, or paper)
* Available Reports
* Vocational Technical Competency Tracking
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Teachers are not using Student Assessment Tools.

1. Curriculum Tools are found under the **Instruction** tab in ET&L. Which components of ET&L **Curriculum Tools** has your district encouraged teachers to use? (Check all that apply.)

* Unit Development Template/Tools
* Curriculum Mapping
* Lesson Planning Tools
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Teachers are not using Curriculum Tools.

**Training on ET&L**

The next questions are about any training you received on ET&L.

1. When did you first receive training on ET&L?

* Spring 2013 (March–June 2013)
* Summer 2013 (July–August 2013)
* Fall 2013 (September–December 2013)
* Spring 2014 (January–June 2014
* Summer 2014 (July–August 2014)
* Fall 2014 (September–December 2014)
* I have not received any training on ET&L yet. [SKIP TO Q18]

1. Please describe the type of training you received on ET&L. (Check all that apply.)

* Face-to-face Spring 2013 training for pilot districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE
* Face-to-face training for other districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE
* Face-to-face training provided by my district
* Webinar and online training provided by Thinkgate and ESE
* Self-paced training using Thinkgate University

1. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the ET&L training?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
| My ET&L trainer was well prepared. |  |  |  |  |
| The training had technical difficulties that hindered the presentation. |  |  |  |  |
| The training answered questions I had. |  |  |  |  |
| The training included information about the online training resources available in Thinkgate University. |  |  |  |  |
| The training prepared me to access the system (i.e., how to login). |  |  |  |  |
| The training prepared me to use the system. |  |  |  |  |

1. Please rate the amount of time spent on each component of ET&L in the training you received:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Too Little** | **About Right** | **Too Much** | **My Training Did Not Address This** |
| Student Assessment Tools |  |  |  |  |
| Curriculum (Instruction) Tools |  |  |  |  |
| Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| Digital Resources (PBS content) |  |  |  |  |

1. Please identify any topics for which you would like to receive further training/resources. (Check all that apply.)

* How to create an assessment
* How to align assessments to standards
* How to administer assessments
* How to generate reports based on assessments
* How to create a curriculum unit
* How to use mapping tools
* How to create a curriculum resource
* How to access digital content
* How to use vocational technical competency tracking resources
* Other role (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Are you aware of the training and reference materials available through Thinkgate University?

* Yes
* No

1. How can ET&L training(s) be improved?
2. Have you started using ET&L outside of your training session?

* Yes
* No

**Student Assessment Tools**

This section is about your useof ET&L’s Student Assessment Tools.

1. How often have you used the **Student Assessment Tools**to do the following this school year?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **This Feature Not Available** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| Create individual assessment items |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use MCAS items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use NWEA items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use Key Data Systems items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use other (third-party) items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administer assessments using bubble sheets (on paper) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administer assessments online (or with clickers) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Generate standard data reports (e.g., Distractor Analysis, Standards by Student) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Track vocational/technical competencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. How much assessment content have you created in ET&L? Estimate the number of **individual assessment items** you have saved in the system:

* None
* Fewer than 10
* 10–99
* 100–199
* More than 200

1. Estimate the number of **whole assessments** you have saved in ET&L:

* None
* Fewer than 2
* 3–5
* 6–9
* More than 10

1. Estimate the number of **assessments you have shared with other educators in your district**:

* None
* Fewer than 2
* 3–5
* 6–9
* More than 10

1. How difficult or straightforward is it to dothe following in the **Student Assessment Tools**?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very Straight-forward** | **Moderately Straight-forward** | **Neither Straight-forward Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Very Difficult** | **Not Applicable/ Never Used** |
| Create individual assessment items |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use MCAS items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use NWEA items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use Key Data Systems items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use other (third-party) items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administer assessments using bubble sheets (on paper) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administer assessments online (or with clickers) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Generate standard data reports (e.g., Distractor Analysis, Standards by Student) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Track vocational/technical competencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. How often have you usedthe **data**from the **Student Assessment Tools** to do the following this school year?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| Identify individual students who need remedial assistance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identify individual students who need extensions or challenges |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identify student groups for instruction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identify and correct gaps in the curriculum for all students |  |  |  |  |  |
| Create or modify benchmark assessments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Align assessments with state standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjust the pace of instruction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Differentiate instruction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjust instructional strategy or learning format |  |  |  |  |  |
| Align curriculum with state standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Align instruction with state standards |  |  |  |  |  |

1. With which of the following people did you review/discuss data or reports from ET&L **Student Assessment Tools**this school year? (Check all that apply.)

* Team leaders/ coaches
* Other teachers
* School administrators
* Parents
* Students
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* I have not used Student Assessment Tools this school year.
* Not applicable

1. To what extent does each of the following represent a barrier to your use of ET&L **Student Assessment Tools**?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not a Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **An Extensive Barrier** |
| I already use another system to create assessments and review student data (e.g., Galileo or TestWiz). |  |  |  |  |
| I don’t yet understand how to create assessments in ET&L. |  |  |  |  |
| I do not know how to access test items outside my grade level or my subject area. |  |  |  |  |
| I cannot find test items appropriate for my subject area. |  |  |  |  |
| I struggle to understand the information in the Student Assessment reports. |  |  |  |  |
| The Student Assessment Tools are not yet fully functional. |  |  |  |  |

**Curriculum Tools**

This section is about your useof ET&L’s Curriculum Tools.

1. How often do you use the **Curriculum Tools** to do the following?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| Utilize Model Curriculum Units available from ESE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Search for instructional materials by standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan/schedule curriculum delivery |  |  |  |  |  |
| Develop or deliver lesson plans |  |  |  |  |  |

1. How difficult or straightforward was it to do the following in the **Curriculum Tools**?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very Straight-forward** | **Moderately Straight-forward** | **Neither Straight-forward Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Very Difficult** | **Not Applicable/ Never Used** |
| Utilize Model Curriculum Units available from ESE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Search for instructional materials by standard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan/schedule curriculum delivery |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Develop or deliver lesson plans |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. To what extent does each of the following represent a barrier to your use of ET&L **Curriculum Tools**?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not a Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **An Extensive Barrier** |
| My current lesson plans have been created using Word/another tool. |  |  |  |  |
| I do not yet understand how to use the Curriculum Tools. |  |  |  |  |
| I do not know how to modify lessons in the Model Curriculum Units. |  |  |  |  |
| The Model Curriculum Units do not pertain to my grade level or subject area. |  |  |  |  |
| The district’s priorities for ET&L do not emphasize Curriculum Tools. |  |  |  |  |

**Digital Resources**

This section is about your useof ET&L’s Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media) this year.

1. How often do you use the **Digital Resources** (PBS Learning Media) to do the following?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| Review digital resources that are available |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link digital resources while creating an assessment or instructional resource in ET&L |  |  |  |  |  |
| Include digital resources in a lesson plan |  |  |  |  |  |

1. How difficult or easy was it to do the following in the **Digital Resources** (PBS Learning Media)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very Easy** | **Moderately Easy** | **Neither Easy Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Very Difficult** | **Not Applicable/ Never Used** |
| Review digital resources that are available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link digital resources while creating an assessment or instructional resource in ET&L |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Include digital resources in a lesson plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. To what extent does the following statement represent a barrier to your school’s use of ET&L **Digital Resources** (PBS Learning Media)?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not a Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **An Extensive Barrier** |
| I have difficulty finding Digital Resources to support my work. |  |  |  |  |
| The Digital Resources available are not relevant to the subject matter I am teaching. |  |  |  |  |
| The videos in the Digital Resources don’t work when I try to use them. |  |  |  |  |
| I am unable to link Digital Resources where I want to use them (e.g., linking a video to a lesson plan or other document). |  |  |  |  |

**District/School Adoption of ET&L**

This final section asks about your opinions of ET&L overall.

1. To what extent is each of the following supporting your use of ET&L?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| School leaders encourage its use. |  |  |  |  |
| Teachers help each other use the system. |  |  |  |  |
| School leaders provide time for teachers to use the system. |  |  |  |  |
| There is a person in my school or district who helps teachers use the system. |  |  |  |  |

1. Please rate your agreement with each of the following statements about ET&L.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Don’t Know/ Not Applicable** |
| The inclusion of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core in the system is a useful feature. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The multiple functionalities in ET&L make it more convenient than other tools. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The availability of digital (PBS) content is a useful feature. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ET&L is encouraging teachers in my school to share information and resources. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ET&L is consistent with other statewide initiatives. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ET&L saves me time. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ET&L is more user friendly than other similar tools I have used. |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Please describe any other condition that supports or hinders your use of ET&L.

You have reached the end of the survey. Thank you for your participation!

II. ET&L Administrator Survey

This survey is part of an evaluation of the Edwin Teaching and Learning (ET&L) system. The evaluation will be used to improve the content and usability of the system. It is being conducted by American Institutes for Research on behalf of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE).

Your participation in the survey is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or to skip questions you do not wish to answer, without penalty. Your responses to this survey are completely confidential, and no personally identifiable data will be shared with your school, district, or ESE. Rather, your responses will be reported in aggregate to help ESE improve the content and usability of the ET&L platform. The survey should take approximately **20 minutes** to complete.

As a thank you for completing the survey, **a code for a $10 gift card for use online at Amazon.com was e-mailed to you with the survey invitation.**

Your answers and opinions are important to allow ESE to revise the ET&L system to make it more useful for educators. Thank you for your input!

*If you would like more information about this evaluation, you may contact the Project Director, Erin Haynes, at American Institutes for Research at 781-373-7017 or at* [*ehaynes@air.org*](mailto:ehaynes@air.org)*.*

**Background Information**

The first questions are about your background.

1. How would you define your primary job role? (Choose one.)

* Department Chair
* Specialist
* Principal
* Assistant Principal
* District Administrator
* District Data Coach
* School Data Coach
* District Academic Coach
* School Academic Coach
* District Technology Coach
* School Technology Coach
* Instructional Leader
* Data Specialist/Analyst
* Other role (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. To what extent are you aware of the state of Massachusetts’s purpose for adopting ET&L?

* Not at all aware
* Minimally aware
* Moderately aware
* Extremely aware

**Purpose of ET&L**

1. Which of the following do you believe are the state of Massachusetts’s major purposes for developing ET&L? (Check all that apply.)

* Facilitate the transition to the Common Core Standards
* Provide Curriculum and Assessment Tools in a single system
* Provide access to use and customize the Model Curriculum Units
* Provide tools that help teachers assess student mastery of standards
* Provide timely and actionable information on students
* Provide tools and resources to support teaching and learning
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* I am not aware of the state’s purposes for developing ET&L.

1. To what extent has the district clearly communicated its purpose for adopting ET&L?

* Not at all
* Minimally
* Moderately
* Extensively

1. Which of the following are the major purposes of the **Student Assessment Tools** in ET&L as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)

* Creating and administering classroom assessments
* Developing common assessments
* Making it quicker/easier to view assessment results
* Facilitating alignment of test items with standards
* Identifying student understanding of different content areas
* Identifying areas for remediation, advanced work, or reteaching
* Tracking vocational/technical competencies
* Coordinating assessment and curriculum in one system
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* I am not aware of the district’s purposes for the Student Assessment Tools.

1. Which of the following are the major purposes of **Curriculum Tools** in ET&L as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)

* Aligning curriculum to state standards and Common Core standards
* Using and/or customizing the state Model Curriculum Units
* Strengthening core instruction (e.g., reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies)
* Synchronizing instruction across the district
* Providing instructional resources to teachers
* Coordinating curriculum and assessment in one system
* Facilitating differentiated instruction
* Facilitating lesson and unit planning with the Understanding by Design template
* Allowing teachers to share lesson plans/planning
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* I am not aware of the district’s purposes for the Curriculum Tools.

**District Encouragement of ET&L Use**

The next questions are about the components of ET&L that your district has encouraged your teachers to use.

1. Which components of ET&L **Student Assessment Tools** has your district encouraged teachers to use? (Check all that apply.)

* Assessment and Item Development Tools
* Assessment Administration (online, clicker, or paper)
* Available Reports
* Vocational Technical Competency Tracking
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Teachers are not using Student Assessment Tools.

1. Which components of ET&L **Curriculum Tools** has your district encouraged teachers to use? (Check all that apply.)

* Unit Development Template/Tools
* Curriculum Mapping
* Lesson Planning Tools
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Teachers are not using Curriculum Tools.

**Training on ET&L**

The next questions are about any training you received on ET&L.

1. When did you first receive training on ET&L?

* Spring 2013 (March–June 2013)
* Summer 2013 (July–August 2013)
* Fall 2013 (September–December 2013)
* Spring 2014 (January–June 2014
* Summer 2014 (July–August 2014)
* Fall 2014 (September–December 2014)
* I have not received any training on ET&L yet. [SKIP TO Q17]

1. Please describe the type of training you received on ET&L. (Check all that apply.)

* Face-to-face Spring 2013 training for pilot districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE
* Face-to-face training for other districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE
* Face-to-face training provided by my district
* Webinar and online training provided by Thinkgate and ESE
* Self-paced training using Thinkgate University

1. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the ET&L training?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
| My ET&L trainer was well prepared. |  |  |  |  |
| The training had technical difficulties that hindered the presentation. |  |  |  |  |
| The training answered questions I had. |  |  |  |  |
| The training included information about the online training resources available in Thinkgate University. |  |  |  |  |
| The training prepared me to access the system (i.e., how to login). |  |  |  |  |
| The training prepared me to use the system. |  |  |  |  |

1. Please rate the amount of time spent on each component of ET&L in the training you received.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Too Little** | **About Right** | **Too Much** | **My Training Did Not Address This** |
| Student Assessment Tools |  |  |  |  |
| Curriculum (Instruction) Tools |  |  |  |  |
| Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| Digital Resources (PBS content) |  |  |  |  |

1. Please identify any topics for which you would like to receive further training/resources. (Check all that apply.)

* How to create an assessment
* How to align assessments to standards
* How to administer assessments
* How to generate reports based on assessments
* How to create a curriculum unit
* How to use mapping tools
* How to create a curriculum resource
* How to access digital content
* How to use vocational technical competency tracking resources
* Other role (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Are you aware of the training and reference materials available through Thinkgate University?

* Yes
* No

1. How can ET&L training(s) be improved?
2. Have you started using ET&L outside of your training session?

* Yes
* No

1. Please indicate Yes or No for the following statements.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **No** |
| I regularly look at the Edwin Twitter feed. |  |  |
| I have visited ESE’s Edwin website. |  |  |
| I receive information about ET&L training opportunities from ESE and/or my district. |  |  |

**Student Assessment Tools**

This section is about your useof ET&L’s Student Assessment Tools this year.

1. How often have you usedthe **Student Assessment Tools**to do the following?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **This Feature Not Available** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| Create individual assessment items |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use MCAS items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use NWEA items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use Key Data Systems items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use other (third-party) items to create an assessment. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Generate standard data reports (e.g., Distractor Analysis, Standards by Student) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Track vocational/technical competencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. How much assessment content have you created in ET&L? Estimate the number of **individual assessment items** you have saved in the system:

* None
* Fewer than 10
* 10–99
* 100–199
* More than 200

1. Estimate the number of **whole assessments** you have saved in ET&L:

* None
* Fewer than 2
* 3–5
* 6–9
* More than 10

1. Estimate the number of **assessments you have shared with other educators in your district**:

* None
* Fewer than 2
* 3–5
* 6–9
* More than 10

1. How difficult or straightforward is it to dothe following in the **Student Assessment Tools**?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very Straight-forward** | **Moderately Straight-forward** | **Neither Straight-forward Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Very Difficult** | **Not Applicable/ Never Used** |
| Create individual assessment items |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use MCAS items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use NWEA items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use Key Data Systems items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use other (third-party) items to create an assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Generate standard data reports (e.g., Distractor Analysis, Standards by Student) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Track vocational/technical competencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. How often have you usedthe **data**from the **Student Assessment Tools** to do the following this school year?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| Identify individual students who need remedial assistance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identify individual students who need extensions or challenges |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identify student groups for instruction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identify and correct gaps in the curriculum for all students |  |  |  |  |  |
| Create or modify benchmark assessments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Align assessments with state standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjust instructional strategy or learning format |  |  |  |  |  |
| Align curriculum with state standards |  |  |  |  |  |

1. With which of the following people did you review/discuss data or reports from ET&L **Student Assessment Tools**this school year? (Check all that apply.)

* Team leaders/coaches
* Teachers
* School administrators
* Parents
* Students
* Not applicable
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. To what extent does each of the following represent a barrier to your use of ET&L **Student Assessment Tools**?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not a Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **An Extensive Barrier** |
| I already use another system to create assessments and review student data (e.g., Galileo or TestWiz). |  |  |  |  |
| I don’t yet understand how to create assessments in ET&L. |  |  |  |  |
| I do not know how to access test items outside the target grade level or subject area. |  |  |  |  |
| I cannot find test items appropriate for the target subject area. |  |  |  |  |
| I struggle to understand the information in the Student Assessment reports. |  |  |  |  |
| The Student Assessment Tools are not yet fully functional. |  |  |  |  |

**Curriculum Tools**

This section is about your useof ET&L’s Curriculum Tools this year.

1. How often do you use the **Curriculum Tools** to do the following?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| Utilize Model Curriculum Units available from ESE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Search for instructional materials by standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan/schedule curriculum delivery |  |  |  |  |  |

1. How difficult or straightforward was it to do the following in the **Curriculum Tools**?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very Straight-forward** | **Moderately Straight-forward** | **Neither Straight-forward Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Very Difficult** | **Not Applicable/ Never Used** |
| Utilize Model Curriculum Units available from ESE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Search for instructional materials by standard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan/schedule curriculum delivery |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. To what extent do the following statements represent a barrier to your school’s use of ET&L **Curriculum Tools**?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not a Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **An Extensive Barrier** |
| The district’s priorities for ET&L do not emphasize Curriculum Tools. |  |  |  |  |
| I already use another system to plan units and lessons. |  |  |  |  |
| I do not yet understand how to use the Curriculum Tools. |  |  |  |  |
| I do not know how to modify lessons in the Model Curriculum Units. |  |  |  |  |
| The Model Curriculum Units do not pertain to my grade level or subject area. |  |  |  |  |

**Digital Resources**

This section is about your useof ET&L’s Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media) this year.

1. How often do you use the **Digital Resources** (PBS Learning Media) to do the following?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| Review digital resources that are available |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link digital resources while creating an assessment or instructional resource in ET&L |  |  |  |  |  |
| Include digital resources in a lesson plan |  |  |  |  |  |

1. How difficult or easy was it to do the following in the **Digital Resources** (PBS Learning Media)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very Easy** | **Moderately Easy** | **Neither Easy Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Very Difficult** | **Not Applicable/ Never Used** |
| Review digital resources that are available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link digital resources while creating an assessment or instructional resource in ET&L |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Include digital resources in a lesson plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. To what extent does the following statement represent a barrier to your school’s use of ET&L **Digital Resources** (PBS Learning Media)?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not a Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **An Extensive Barrier** |
| I have difficulty finding Digital Resources to support my work. |  |  |  |  |
| The Digital Resources available are not relevant to the subject matter I am teaching. |  |  |  |  |
| The videos in the Digital Resources don’t work when I try to use them. |  |  |  |  |
| I am unable to link Digital Resources where I want to use them (e.g., linking a video to a lesson plan or other document). |  |  |  |  |

**District/School Adoption of ET&L**

This final section asks about your opinions of ET&L overall.

1. To what extent is each of the following supporting your school’s use of ET&L?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| School leaders encourage its use. |  |  |  |  |
| Teachers help each other use the system. |  |  |  |  |
| School leaders provide time for teachers to use the system. |  |  |  |  |
| There is a person in my school or district who helps teachers use the system. |  |  |  |  |

1. Please rate your agreement with each of the following statements about ET&L.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Don’t Know/ Not Applicable** |
| The inclusion of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core in the system is a useful feature. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The multiple functionalities in ET&L make it more convenient than other tools. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The availability of digital (PBS) content is a useful feature. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ET&L is encouraging teachers in my school to share information and resources. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ET&L is consistent with other statewide initiatives. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ET&L saves me time. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ET&L is more user friendly than other similar tools I have used. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ET&L is worth the investment of $2.50-$6 per pupil |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Please describe any other condition that supports or hinders your use of ET&L.

You have reached the end of the survey. Thank you for your participation!

III. Edwin Analytics Survey

This survey is part of an evaluation of the Edwin Analytics System. The evaluation will be used to improve the content and usability of the system. It is being conducted by American Institutes for Research on behalf of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE).

Your participation in the survey is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or to skip questions you do not wish to answer, without penalty. Your responses to this survey are completely confidential, and no personally identifiable data will be shared with your school, district, or ESE. Rather, your responses will be reported in aggregate to help ESE improve the content and usability of the Edwin Analytics platform. The survey should take approximately   
**20 minutes** to complete.

As a thank you for completing the survey, **a code for a $15 gift card for use online at Amazon.com was e-mailed to you with this survey invitation.**

Your answers and opinions are important to allow ESE to revise the Edwin Analytics system to make it more useful for educators and administrators. Thank you for your input!

*If you would like more information about this evaluation, you may contact the Project Director, Erin Haynes, at American Institutes for Research at 781-373-7017 or at* [*ehaynes@air.org*](mailto:ehaynes@air.org)*.*

Background

The first question is about your background.

1. How would you define your primary job role? (Choose one.)

* Principal
* Assistant Principal
* District Data Coach
* School Data Coach
* District Academic Coach
* School Academic Coach
* District Technology Coach
* School Technology Coach
* Superintendent
* Assistant Superintendent
* Curriculum Coordinator
* Special Education Coordinator
* General Education Teacher
* Special Education Teacher
* English Language Learner (ELL) Teacher
* Dual Language Learner (DLL) Teacher
* English as a Second Language (ESL) Teacher
* Career Vocational and Technical Education (CVTE) Teacher
* District Technology/Data Coordinator
* School Technology/Data Coordinator
* Other District Administrator (not listed above)
* Other role (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Purpose of Edwin Analytics

The questions in this section are about the purpose of Edwin Analytics as you understand it.

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neutral** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
| The **state** has clearly communicated the purpose of Edwin Analytics. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **district** has clearly communicated the purpose of Edwin Analytics. |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Which of the following are the major purposes of Edwin Analytics as expressed by the state? (Check all that apply.)

* Giving educators a more comprehensive view of students, teachers, schools, districts, and the state
* Providing timely and actionable information
* Providing tools and resources that will help educators improve teaching and learning
* Providing tools and resources that will help educators improve school readiness
* Providing tools and resources that will help educators improve education outcomes
* Decreasing achievement gaps
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Which of the following are the major purposes of Edwin Analytics as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)

* Providing early intervention for students who are struggling
* Understanding if students are ready for school (in Grades K–3)
* Understanding if students are ready for college
* Understanding how past students have done in postsecondary education
* Understanding district finances
* Tracking assessment results
* Identifying gaps in curriculum
* Identifying achievement gaps
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Expectations and Communication about Edwin Analytics

1. Which of the following types of reports from Edwin Analytics does your district expect you to use? (Check all that apply.)

* Achievement Analysis
* Item Analysis
* Student Growth Analysis
* Curriculum Analysis
* Early Warning Indicators (EWIS)
* Postsecondary Analysis
* Classroom Analysis
* Enrollment Indicators (attendance, demographics, educational environment, retention, suspension)
* Staffing Indicators
* Financial Indicators
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. The next questions are about information you have received about Edwin Analytics. Please indicate Yes or No for the following statements.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **No** |
| I received information about Edwin Analytics training opportunities from ESE and/or my district. |  |  |
| I received information about Edwin Analytics webinars. |  |  |
| I received information about Edwin Analytics EWIS video tutorials. |  |  |
| I have visited ESE’s Edwin website. |  |  |

Your Use of Edwin Analytics

1. How often have you used Edwin Analytics in the past year?

* Never
* Occasionally
* Somewhat frequently
* Very frequently

1. When do you typically use Edwin Analytics? (Check all that apply.)

* In the summer before the school year starts
* At the beginning of the school year
* At the end of the quarter, around report card time
* Around benchmark or interim assessment administration
* As data are updated in the system
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Please rate the extent to which you use each of the following in Edwin Analytics.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| Achievement Analysis |  |  |  |  |
| Item Analysis |  |  |  |  |
| Student Growth Analysis |  |  |  |  |
| Curriculum Analysis |  |  |  |  |
| Early Warning Indicators (EWIS) |  |  |  |  |
| Postsecondary Analysis |  |  |  |  |
| Classroom Analysis |  |  |  |  |
| Enrollment Indicators (attendance, demographics, educational environment, retention, suspension) |  |  |  |  |
| Staffing Indicators |  |  |  |  |
| District Determined Measures |  |  |  |  |
| District Finances |  |  |  |  |

1. To what extent do you use data in Edwin Analytics for each of the following purposes?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| To track assessment results |  |  |  |  |
| To identify individual students who are  off track for graduation |  |  |  |  |
| To identify individual students who need remedial assistance |  |  |  |  |
| To identify and correct gaps in the curriculum for all students |  |  |  |  |
| To identify achievement gaps |  |  |  |  |
| To track expenditures and resource allocation |  |  |  |  |

1. Do you discuss data pulled from Edwin Analytics with other staff in your school or district?

* Yes
* No [SKIP TO Q13]

1. Please indicate the ways you discuss data pulled from Edwin Analytics with other staff in your school or district. (Check all that apply.)

* In district level meetings
* In grade level meetings
* In leadership team meetings
* In content area or department meetings
* Informally between teachers
* Other (Please specify.) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Opinions of Edwin Analytics

1. To what extent does Edwin Analytics meet your data analysis needs?

* Not at all
* Minimally
* Moderately
* Extensively

1. Please rate the extent to which each of the following supports your use of Edwin Analytics.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| School and district leaders provide time for use of Edwin Analytics. |  |  |  |  |
| School and district leaders provide ongoing training for use of Edwin Analytics. |  |  |  |  |
| School and district leaders encourage collaboration with other staff on the use of Edwin Analytics. |  |  |  |  |
| School and district leaders encourage staff to use Edwin Analytics to help in decreasing achievement gaps. |  |  |  |  |

1. To what extent does each of the following represent a barrier to your use of Edwin Analytics?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| I didn’t receive sufficient training on how to use Edwin Analytics. |  |  |  |  |
| Edwin Analytics is not user-friendly. |  |  |  |  |
| I don’t understand the meaning of the different reports. |  |  |  |  |
| The reports in the system are not the ones I need. |  |  |  |  |
| The data are provided too late to be useful. |  |  |  |  |
| The data in Edwin Analytics are inaccurate. |  |  |  |  |
| I don’t have sufficient time to think about the available data. |  |  |  |  |
| I already use another system to review student data (e.g., Galileo or TestWiz). |  |  |  |  |
| Edwin Analytics is not connected to other statewide initiatives. |  |  |  |  |

1. Please describe any other condition that supports or hinders your use of Edwin Analytics.

You have reached the end of the survey. Thank you for your participation!

# Appendix F. ET&L and Analytics Survey Frequency Tables

I. ET&L Teacher Survey

**Respondent Background**

**Table F1. Grades Taught by Survey Respondents, *N =*153**

| **Which grade(s) do you teach? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Prekindergarten | 2.6% |
| Kindergarten | 17.6% |
| First | 20.9% |
| Second | 22.2% |
| Third | 27.5% |
| Fourth | 28.1% |
| Fifth | 31.4% |
| Sixth | 17.6% |
| Seventh | 13.7% |
| Eighth | 11.8% |
| Ninth | 11.1% |
| Tenth | 12.4% |
| Eleventh | 14.4% |
| Twelfth | 14.4% |
| Ages 18–22 students | 0.7% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**Table F2. Survey Respondents’ Primary Job Role, *N =*158**

| **How would you define your primary job role? (Choose one.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| General education teacher | 58.2% |
| Academic coach | 8.9% |
| Special education teacher | 6.3% |
| Specialist | 6.3% |
| Instructional leader | 4.4% |
| English language learner (ELL) teacher | 3.8% |
| Department chair | 3.2% |
| Technology coach | 3.2% |
| District administrator | 1.3% |
| Data coach | 1.3% |
| Principal | 0.6% |
| Assistant principal | 0.6% |
| Dual language learner (DLL) teacher | 0.0% |
| English as a second language (ESL) teacher | 0.0% |
| Career, vocational, and technical education teacher (CVTE) | 0.0% |
| Other role\* | 1.9% |

\*Guidance counselor (1.3%), special education coordinator (0.6%)

**Definition and Communication of ET&L Goals, Timelines, and Excepted Uses**

**Table F3. Awareness of the State’s Purpose for Developing ET&L, *N =*157**

| **To what extent are you aware of the State of Massachusetts’s purpose for adopting ET&L?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Not at all aware | 7.6% |
| Minimally aware | 33.1% |
| Moderately aware | 50.3% |
| Extremely aware | 8.9% |

**Table F4. Beliefs of the State’s Purpose for Development of ET&L, *N =*156**

| **Which of the following do you believe are the State of Massachusetts’s major purposes for developing ET&L? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Provide curriculum and assessment tools in a single system. | 76.9% |
| Provide tools that help teachers assess student mastery of standards. | 69.9% |
| Providing tools and resources to support teaching and learning | 61.5% |
| Provide timely and actionable information on students. | 60.3% |
| Facilitate the transition to the Common Core State Standards. | 59.0% |
| Provide access to use and customize the Model Curriculum Units. | 46.2% |
| I am not aware of the State’s purposes for developing ET&L. | 6.4% |
| Other\* | 3.8% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\*For example: To support curriculum development with resources, to evaluate teachers, to have a universal database for assessment across the state.

**Table F5. District Communication of Purpose for Adopting ET&L, *N =*157**

| **To what extent has the district clearly communicated its purpose for adopting ET&L?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Not at all | 8.9% |
| Minimally | 42.7% |
| Moderately | 45.2% |
| Extensively | 3.2% |

**Table F6. Purpose of Assessment Tools in ET&L, *N =*156**

| **Which of the following are the major purposes of the Student Assessment Tools in ET&L as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Developing common assessments | 67.3% |
| Creating and administering classroom assessments | 61.5% |
| Facilitating alignment of test items with standards | 55.8% |
| Identifying areas for remediation, advanced work, or reteaching | 55.8% |
| Making it quicker/easier to view assessment results | 55.1% |
| Identifying student understanding of different content areas | 46.2% |
| Coordinating assessment and curriculum in one system | 36.5% |
| I am not aware of the district’s purposes for the Student Assessment Tools. | 14.1% |
| Tracking vocational/technical competencies | 5.8% |
| Evaluating teachers | 1.3% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**Table F7. Purpose of Curriculum Tools in ET&L, *N =*157**

| **Which of the following are the major purposes of Curriculum Tools in ET&L as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Aligning curriculum to State standards and Common Core standards | 52.2% |
| Coordinating curriculum and assessment in one system | 42.7% |
| Providing instructional resources to teachers | 40.8% |
| Synchronizing instruction across the district | 37.6% |
| Strengthening core instruction (e.g., reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies) | 35.7% |
| Using and/or customizing the State Model Curriculum Units | 31.2% |
| Allowing teachers to share lesson plans/planning | 29.3% |
| I am not aware of the district’s purposes for the Curriculum Tools. | 28.7% |
| Facilitating differentiated instruction | 24.8% |
| Facilitating lesson and unit planning with the Understanding by Design template | 15.9% |
| Other\* | 1.3% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\*Collaboration (0.6%), Common Benchmark Assessments (0.6%)

**Table F8. District Encouragement of Use of Assessment Tools, *N =*151**

| **Which components of ET&L Student Assessment Tools has your district encouraged teachers to use? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment and Item Development Tools | 62.3% |
| Assessment Administration (online, clicker, or paper) | 43.0% |
| Available Reports | 38.4% |
| Teachers are not using Student Assessment Tools. | 27.8% |
| Vocational Technical Competency Tracking | 0.0% |
| Other\* | 2.0% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\*None (0.7%), not sure (1.3%)

**Table F9. District Encouragement of Use of Curriculum Tools, *N =*145**

| **Which components of ET&L Curriculum Tools has your district encouraged teachers to use? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Teachers are not using Curriculum Tools. | 60.0% |
| Lesson Planning Tools | 23.4% |
| Unit Development Template/Tools | 21.4% |
| Curriculum Mapping | 17.2% |
| Other\* | 4.8% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\*None (0.7%), not sure (4.1%)

**ET&L Training**

**Table F10. Respondents’ Time of ET&L Training, *N =*151**

| **When did you first receive training in ET&L?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Spring 2013 (March–June, 2013) | 33.1% |
| Summer 2013 (July–August, 2013) | 12.6% |
| Fall 2013 (September–December, 2013) | 29.1% |
| Spring 2014 (January–June, 2014) | 14.6% |
| Summer 2014 (July–August, 2014) | 0.0% |
| Fall 2014 (September–December, 2014) | 1.3% |
| I have not received any training in ET&L yet. | 9.3% |

**Table F11. Respondents Type of Training Received, *N =*134**

| **Please describe the type of training you received on ET&L. (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Face-to-face training provided by my district | 41.8% |
| Webinar and online training provided by Thinkgate and ESE | 38.8% |
| Self-paced training using Thinkgate University | 25.4% |
| Face-to-face spring 2013 training for pilot districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE | 20.1% |
| Face-to-face training for other districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE | 3.0% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**Table F12. Survey Responses on Aspects of ET&L Trainings**

| **How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the ET&L training?** | ***N*** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Disagree** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| My ET&L trainer was well prepared. | 124 | 1.6% | 20.2% | 54.8% | 23.4% |
| The training had technical difficulties that hindered the presentation. | 128 | 7.0% | 28.9% | 50.0% | 14.1% |
| The training answered questions I had. | 128 | 3.1% | 34.4% | 53.1% | 9.4% |
| The training included information about the online training resources available in Thinkgate University. | 128 | 2.3% | 19.5% | 59.4% | 18.8% |
| The training prepared me to access the system (i.e., how to log in). | 130 | 3.8% | 13.8% | 59.2% | 23.1% |
| The training prepared me to use the system. | 129 | 3.9% | 28.7% | 58.1% | 9.3% |

**Table F13. Survey Responses on Time Spent in ET&L Trainings**

| **Please rate the amount of time spent on each component of ET&L in the training you received:** | ***N*** | **Too Little** | **About Right** | **Too Much** | **My training did not address this.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Assessment Tools | 127 | 26.0% | 68.5% | 3.1% | 2.4% |
| Curriculum (Instruction) Tools | 127 | 44.1% | 36.2% | 0.8% | 18.9% |
| Reporting | 127 | 44.1% | 44.9% | 0.8% | 10.2% |
| Digital Resources (PBS content) | 121 | 38.8% | 27.3% | 0.8% | 33.1% |

**Table F14. Interest in Future Training on Various Topics, *N =*118**

| **Please identify any topics for which you would like to receive further training/resources. Select all that apply.** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| How to generate reports based on assessments | 52.5% |
| How to create a curriculum unit | 50.8% |
| How to create a curriculum resource | 50.0% |
| How to use mapping tools | 45.8% |
| How to access digital content | 44.9% |
| How to create an assessments | 33.9% |
| How to administer assessments | 33.9% |
| How to align assessments to standards | 30.5% |
| How to use vocational technical competency tracking resources | 9.3% |
| Other\* | 3.4% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\*How to analyze assessment data (0.8%), how to share assessments with other teachers (0.8%), how to use ET&L for noncore subject areas (1.7%)

**Table F15. Awareness of Materials Available Through Thinkgate University, *N =*133**

| **Are you aware of the training and reference materials available through Thinkgate University?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | 64.7% |
| No | 35.3% |

**Table F16. Suggestions for Improvement of ET&L Trainings, *N = 57***

| **How can ET&L training(s) be improved?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Follow-up sessions and/or time for practice after initial training are needed. | 21.1% |
| Improve software usability/user-friendliness. | 15.8% |
| Increase functionality and/or teacher access to functions. | 14.0% |
| Improve communication on the trainings and the districts goals for use. | 8.8% |
| Improve trainer quality. | 8.8% |
| More face-to-face trainings should be offered, and/or they should be available in more locations (e.g., in local schools/districts and in all corners of the State). | 8.8% |
| Increase time in training sessions, and/or frequency of sessions. | 7.0% |
| Training should be more practical (i.e., target school/district needs and exemplar tasks) and less broad. | 5.3% |
| Training should incorporate more time for user practice. | 5.3% |
| Mature software would improve trainings (e.g., problems stemmed from system bugs, glitches, and limited functionality due to program immaturity). | 3.5% |
| Trainings should utilize a step-by-step approach and include step-by-step reference materials that trainees can take home. | 1.8% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**ET&L Users and Uses**

**Table F17. Use of ET&L Outside of Training, *N =*134**

| **Have you started using ET&L outside of your training session?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | 51.5% |
| No | 48.5% |

**Table F18. Frequency of Use of Assessment Tools**

| **How often have you used the Student Assessment Tools to do the following this school year?** | ***N*** | **This Feature Not Available** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Create individual assessment items | 133 | 6.0% | 57.1% | 21.1% | 9.8% | 6.0% | 0.0% |
| Use MCAS items to create an assessment | 134 | 6.7% | 56.7% | 19.4% | 10.4% | 6.7% | 0.0% |
| Use NWEA items to create an assessment | 131 | 8.4% | 67.9% | 13.7% | 5.3% | 4.6% | 0.0% |
| Use Key Data Systems items to create an assessment | 130 | 10.8% | 74.6% | 7.7% | 6.2% | 0.8% | 0.0% |
| Use other (third-party) items to create an assessment | 131 | 8.4% | 74.8% | 7.6% | 3.8% | 4.6% | 0.8% |
| Administer assessments using bubble sheets (on paper) | 131 | 6.1% | 60.3% | 19.8% | 12.2% | 1.5% | 0.0% |
| Administer assessments online (or with clickers) | 132 | 7.6% | 77.3% | 9.8% | 4.5% | 0.8% | 0.0% |
| Generate standard data reports (e.g., Distractor Analysis, Standards by Student) | 131 | 7.6% | 68.7% | 15.3% | 6.1% | 2.3% | 0.0% |
| Track vocational/technical competencies | 131 | 13.0% | 84.7% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F19. Use of ET&L Individual Assessment, *N =*136**

| **How much assessment content have you created in ET&L? Estimate the number of individual assessment items you have saved in the system:** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| None | 45.6% |
| Fewer than 10 | 41.9% |
| 10–99 | 6.6% |
| 100–199 | 4.4% |
| More than 200 | 1.5% |

**Table F20. Use of ET&L Whole Assessment, *N =*135**

| **Estimate the number of whole assessments you have saved in ET&L:** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| None | 50.4% |
| Fewer than 2 | 20.0% |
| 3–5 | 14.8% |
| 6–9 | 6.7% |
| More than 10 | 8.1% |

**Table F21. Use of ET&L Number of Assessments Shared, *N =*132**

| **Estimate the number of assessments you have shared with other educators in your district:** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| None | 59.1% |
| Fewer than 2 | 22.0% |
| 3–5 | 11.4% |
| 6–9 | 3.8% |
| More than 10 | 3.8% |

**Table F22. Ease of Use of Assessment Tools**

| **How difficult or straightforward is it to do the following in the Student Assessment Tools?** | ***N*** | **Very Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Neither Straight- forward Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Straight- forward** | **Very Straight- forward** | **NA/  Never Used** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Create individual assessment items | 134 | 10.4% | 24.0% | 21.9% | 33.3% | 10.4% | 28.4% |
| Use MCAS items to create an assessment | 133 | 9.5% | 17.9% | 20.2% | 38.1% | 14.3% | 36.8% |
| Use NWEA items to create an assessment | 132 | 9.5% | 23.0% | 23.0% | 32.4% | 12.2% | 43.9% |
| Use Key Data Systems items to create an assessment | 130 | 14.5% | 30.9% | 25.5% | 25.5% | 3.6% | 57.7% |
| Use other (third- party) items to create an assessment | 133 | 20.3% | 25.0% | 31.3% | 15.6% | 7.8% | 51.9% |
| Administer assessments using bubble sheets (on paper) | 135 | 10.5% | 19.7% | 21.1% | 30.3% | 18.4% | 43.7% |
| Administer assessments online (or with clickers) | 132 | 12.5% | 32.8% | 20.3% | 31.3% | 3.1% | 51.5% |
| Generate standard data reports (e.g., distractor analysis, Standards by Student) | 130 | 13.0% | 23.2% | 23.2% | 34.8% | 5.8% | 46.9% |
| Track vocational/technical competencies | 128 | 18.8% | 31.3% | 31.3% | 12.5% | 6.3% | 75.0% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100. Easy to difficult options are calculated out of the sample who indicated use; *N* excludes those who responded NA.

**Table F23. Frequency of Use of Data From Assessment Tools**

| **How often have you used the data from the Student Assessment Tools to do the following this school year?** | ***N*** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Identify individual students who need remedial assistance | 135 | 65.2% | 23.0% | 8.1% | 3.7% | 0.0% |
| Identify individual students who need extensions or challenges | 134 | 67.9% | 22.4% | 6.7% | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| Identify student groups for instruction | 133 | 68.4% | 20.3% | 8.3% | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| Identify and correct gaps in the curriculum for all students | 132 | 68.2% | 18.9% | 9.1% | 3.8% | 0.0% |
| Create or modify benchmark assessments | 132 | 66.7% | 23.5% | 5.3% | 4.5% | 0.0% |
| Align assessments with state standards | 129 | 66.7% | 19.4% | 8.5% | 5.4% | 0.0% |
| Adjust the pace of instruction | 134 | 70.1% | 17.2% | 9.0% | 3.7% | 0.0% |
| Differentiate instruction | 133 | 66.2% | 21.8% | 7.5% | 4.5% | 0.0% |
| Adjust instructional strategy or learning format | 134 | 68.7% | 19.4% | 7.5% | 4.5% | 0.0% |
| Align curriculum with state standards | 132 | 69.7% | 20.5% | 4.5% | 5.3% | 0.0% |
| Align instruction with state standards | 130 | 69.2% | 20.0% | 5.4% | 5.4% | 0.0% |

**Table F24. Use of Assessment Tool Data/Reports With Others, *N =*135**

| **With which of the following people did you review/discuss data or reports from ET&L Student Assessment Tools this school year? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Other teachers | 37.0% |
| Team leaders/coaches | 32.6% |
| I have not used Student Assessment Tools this school year. | 32.6% |
| Not applicable | 23.0% |
| School administrators | 22.2% |
| Students | 8.9% |
| Parents | 2.2% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**Table F25. Barriers to Use of Assessment Tools**

| **To what extent does each of the following represent a barrier to your use of ET&L Student Assessment Tools?** | ***N*** | **An Extensive Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **Not a Barrier** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I already use another system to create assessments and review student data (e.g., Galileo or TestWiz). | 128 | 14.8% | 17.2% | 15.6% | 52.3% |
| I don’t yet understand how to create assessments in ET&L. | 127 | 15.7% | 18.9% | 16.5% | 48.8% |
| I do not know how to access to test items outside my grade level or my subject area. | 127 | 16.5% | 16.5% | 22.0% | 44.9% |
| I cannot find test items appropriate for my subject area. | 130 | 16.9% | 16.2% | 22.3% | 44.6% |
| I struggle to understand the information in the Student Assessment reports. | 125 | 12.0% | 10.4% | 21.6% | 56.0% |
| The Student Assessment Tools are not yet fully functional. | 125 | 24.8% | 16.0% | 20.0% | 39.2% |

**Table F26. Frequency of Use of Curriculum Tools**

| **How often do you use the Curriculum Tools to do the following?** | ***N*** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Utilize Model Curriculum Units available from ESE | 135 | 78.5% | 16.3% | 3.0% | 1.5% | 0.7% |
| Search for instructional materials by standard | 133 | 74.4% | 16.5% | 4.5% | 3.8% | 0.8% |
| Plan/schedule curriculum delivery | 134 | 82.8% | 9.7% | 3.7% | 3.0% | 0.7% |
| Develop or deliver lesson plans | 133 | 84.2% | 8.3% | 3.8% | 1.5% | 2.3% |

**Table F27. Ease of Use of Curriculum Tools**

| **How difficult or straightforward was it to do the following in the Student Assessment Tools?** | ***N*** | **Very Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Neither Straight- forward Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Straight- forward** | **Very Straight- forward** | **NA/ Never Used** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Utilize Model Curriculum available from ESE | 133 | 11.1% | 14.8% | 27.8% | 16.7% | 29.6% | 59.4% |
| Search for instructional materials by standard | 132 | 11.7% | 13.3% | 30.0% | 21.7% | 23.3% | 54.5% |
| Plan/schedule curriculum delivery | 132 | 19.1% | 10.6% | 27.7% | 23.4% | 19.1% | 64.4% |
| Develop or deliver lesson plans | 129 | 18.2% | 11.4% | 34.1% | 18.2% | 18.2% | 65.9% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100. Easy to difficult options are calculated out of   
the sample who indicated use; *N* excludes those who responded NA.

**Factors and Conditions That Support or Hinder Use of ET&L**

**Table F28. Barriers to Use of Curriculum Tools**

| **To what extent does each of the following represent a barrier to your use of ET&L Curriculum Tools?** | ***N*** | **An Extensive Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **Not a Barrier** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| My current lesson plans have been created using Word/another tool. | 122 | 28.7% | 22.1% | 14.8% | 34.4% |
| I do not yet understand how to use the Curriculum Tools. | 126 | 31.7% | 26.2% | 19.0% | 23.0% |
| I do not know how to modify lessons in the Model Curriculum Units. | 124 | 28.2% | 23.4% | 21.0% | 27.4% |
| The Model Curriculum Units do not pertain to my grade level or subject area. | 123 | 23.6% | 17.9% | 16.3% | 42.3% |
| The district’s priorities for ET&L do not emphasize Curriculum Tools. | 120 | 29.2% | 25.0% | 17.5% | 28.3% |

**Table F29. Frequency of Use of Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media)**

| **How often do you use the Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media) to do the following?** | ***N*** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Review digital resources that are available | 134 | 83.6% | 11.2% | 3.0% | 1.5% | 0.7% |
| Link digital resources while creating an assessment or instructional resource in ET&L | 132 | 89.4% | 9.1% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 0.8% |
| Include digital resources in lesson plan | 134 | 84.3% | 9.7% | 2.2% | 2.2% | 1.5% |

**Table F30. Ease of Use of Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media)**

| **How difficult or easy is it to do the following in the Digital Resources?** | ***N*** | **Very  Easy** | **Moderately Easy** | **Neither Easy Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Very Difficult** | **NA/ Never Used** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Review digital resources that are available | 132 | 42.3% | 19.2% | 26.9% | 3.8% | 7.7% | 80.3% |
| Link digital resources while creating an assessment or instructional resource in ET&L | 130 | 17.4% | 17.4% | 52.2% | 0.0% | 13.0% | 82.3% |
| Include digital resources in a lesson plan | 131 | 20.8% | 29.2% | 37.5% | 4.2% | 8.3% | 81.7% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100. Easy to difficult options are calculated out of the sample who indicated use; *N* excludes those who responded NA.

**Factors and Conditions That Support or Hinder Use of ET&L**

**Table F31. Barriers to Use of Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media)**

| **To what extent do the following statements represent a barrier to your school’s use of ET&L Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media)?** | ***N*** | **Not a Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **An Extensive Barrier** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I have difficulty finding Digital Resources to support my work. | 113 | 48.7% | 15.0% | 11.5% | 24.8% |
| The Digital Resources available are not relevant to the subject matter I am teaching. | 113 | 51.3% | 13.3% | 11.5% | 23.9% |
| The videos in the Digital Resources don’t work when I try to use them. | 111 | 52.3% | 10.8% | 11.7% | 25.2% |
| I am unable to link Digital Resources where I want to use them (e.g., linking a video to a lesson plan or other document). | 112 | 45.5% | 11.6% | 15.2% | 27.7% |

**Table F32. Factors Supporting Use of ET&L**

| **To what extent is each of the following supporting your use of ET&L?** | ***N*** | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School leaders encourage its use. | 130 | 29.2% | 40.8% | 23.8% | 6.2% |
| Teachers help each other use the system. | 128 | 37.5% | 35.2% | 18.8% | 8.6% |
| School leaders provide time for teachers to use the system. | 131 | 57.3% | 32.8% | 8.4% | 1.5% |
| There is a person in my school or district who helps teachers use the system. | 130 | 30.8% | 38.5% | 23.8% | 6.9% |

**Table F33. Perceived Benefits of ET&L**

| **Please rate your agreement with each of the following statements about ET&L.** | ***N*** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Disagree** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** | **Don’t Know/NA** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The inclusion of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core in the system is a useful feature. | 130 | 1.5% | 0.8% | 51.5% | 22.3% | 23.8% |
| The multiple functionalities in ET&L make it more convenient than other tools. | 130 | 5.4% | 15.4% | 26.9% | 5.4% | 46.9% |
| ET&L is encouraging teachers in my school to share information and resources. | 129 | 0.8% | 3.9% | 23.3% | 5.4% | 66.7% |
| ET&L is consistent with other Statewide initiatives. | 128 | 9.4% | 21.1% | 21.1% | 5.5% | 43.0% |
| ET&L saves me time. | 127 | 5.5% | 11.8% | 26.8% | 7.1% | 48.8% |
| ET&L is more user friendly than other similar tools I have used. | 127 | 21.3% | 15.7% | 15.7% | 5.5% | 41.7% |

**Table F34. Other Supports of, or Barriers to, Use of ET&L *N =*47**

| **Please describe any other condition that supports or hinders your use of ET&L.** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Contents of system are frequently out-of-date (i.e., standards missing, incorrect student lists, SIF not working). | 23.4% |
| Program is not user-friendly/there are problems with usability that hinder use. | 17.0% |
| Limited software functionality is a hindrance. | 14.9% |
| Trainings were insufficient. | 14.9% |
| I use another program that meets my needs. | 8.5% |
| My district is not focusing on ET&L or encouraging its use. | 8.5% |
| Insufficient hardware (computer access and scanners) is a hindrance. | 6.4% |
| Limited technical support (within school district or Thinkgate) hinders use. | 2.1% |
| The data analysis and reports are the best features. | 2.1% |
| The number of initiatives from the State and school districts strains time and resources. | 2.1% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

II. ET&L Administrator Survey

**Respondent Background**

**Table F35. Survey Respondents’ Primary Job Role, *N* = 53**

| **How would you define your primary job role? (Choose one.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| District administrator | 30.2% |
| School academic coach | 20.8% |
| Principal | 13.2% |
| Assistant principal | 7.5% |
| Data specialist/analyst | 7.5% |
| Instructional leader | 5.7% |
| District technology coach | 3.8% |
| Specialist | 1.9% |
| District data coach | 1.9% |
| Department chair | 0.0% |
| School data coach | 0.0% |
| District academic coach | 0.0% |
| School technology coach | 0.0% |
| Other\* | 9.4% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

\*Teacher (3.7%), superintendent (1.9%), curriculum specialist (1.9%), and direct of special services (1.9%)

**Definition and Communication of ET&L Goals, Timelines, and Excepted Uses**

**Table F36. Awareness of the State’s Purpose for Adopting ET&L, *N* = 53**

| **To what extent are you aware of the State of Massachusetts’s purpose for adopting ET&L?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Not at all aware | 0.0% |
| Minimally aware | 13.2% |
| Moderately aware | 56.6% |
| Extremely aware | 30.2% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F37. Beliefs of the State’s Purpose for Developing ET&L, *N* = 53**

| **Which of the following do you believe are the State of Massachusetts’s major purposes for developing ET&L? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Provide Curriculum and Assessment Tools in a single system. | 88.7% |
| Provide tools and resources to support teaching and learning. | 84.9% |
| Provide tools that help teachers assess student mastery of standards. | 73.6% |
| Provide timely and actionable information on students. | 71.7% |
| Provide access to use and customize the Model Curriculum Units. | 66.0% |
| Facilitate the transition to the Common Core State Standards. | 58.5% |
| I am not aware of the State’s purposes for developing ET&L. | 0.0% |
| Other | 0.0% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**Table F38. District Communication of Purpose for Adopting ET&L, *N* = 53**

| **To what extent has the district clearly communicated its purpose for adopting ET&L?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Not at all | 1.9% |
| Minimally | 47.2% |
| Moderately | 39.6% |
| Extensively | 11.3% |

**Table F39. Purpose of Assessment Tools in ET&L, *N* = 53**

| **Which of the following are the major purposes of the Student Assessment Tools in ET&L as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Developing common assessments | 71.7% |
| Facilitating alignment of test items with standards | 56.6% |
| Making it quicker/easier to view assessment results | 54.7% |
| Creating and administering classroom assessments | 50.9% |
| Identifying areas for remediation, advanced work, or reteaching | 49.1% |
| Coordinate assessment and curriculum in one system | 47.2% |
| Identifying student understanding of different content areas | 35.8% |
| Tracking vocational/technical competencies | 7.5% |
| Other | 1.9% |
| I am not aware of the district’s purposes for the Student Assessment Tools. | 0.0% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**Table F40. Purpose of Curriculum Tools in ET&L, *N* = 48**

| **Which of the following are the major purposes of Curriculum Tools in ET&L as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Providing instructional resources to teachers | 50.0% |
| Coordinate curriculum and assessment in one system | 50.0% |
| Using and/or customizing the State Model Curriculum Units | 47.9% |
| Aligning curriculum to State standards and Common Core State Standards | 43.8% |
| Strengthening core instruction (e.g., reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies) | 35.4% |
| Allowing teachers to share lesson plans/planning | 29.2% |
| Synchronizing instruction across the district | 27.1% |
| Facilitating lesson and unit planning with the Understanding by Design template | 22.9% |
| Facilitating differentiated instruction | 18.8% |
| I am not aware of the district’s purposes for the Curriculum Tools. | 14.6% |
| Other (testing) | 2.1% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**Table F41. District Encouragement of Use of Assessment Tools, *N* = 46**

| **Which components of ET&L Student Assessment Tools has your district encouraged teachers to use? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment and item development tools | 41.2% |
| Available reports | 35.3% |
| Assessment administration (online, clicker, or paper) | 33.3% |
| Teachers are not using Student Assessment Tools. | 31.4% |
| Vocational technical competency tracking | 2.0% |
| Other\* | 5.9% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\*District determined measures (2.0%), not aware of district encouragement (2.0%), none (2.0%)

**Table F42. District Encouragement of Use of Curriculum Tools, *N* = 47**

| **Which components of ET&L Curriculum Tools has your district encouraged teachers to use? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Teachers are not using Curriculum Tools | 76.6% |
| Lesson planning tools | 17.0% |
| Unit development template/tools | 14.9% |
| Curriculum mapping | 10.6% |
| Other\* | 4.2% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\*Not aware of district encouragement (2.1%), none (2.1%)

**ET&L Training**

**Table F43. Respondents Time of ET&L Training, *N* = 53**

| **When did you first receive training on ET&L?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Spring 2013 (March–June, 2013) | 32.1% |
| Summer 2013 (July–August, 2013) | 0.0% |
| Fall 2013 (September–December, 2013) | 28.3% |
| Spring 2014 (January–June, 2014) | 26.4% |
| Summer 2014 (July–August, 2014) | 0.0% |
| Fall 2014 (September–December, 2014) | 13.2% |
| I have not received any training in ET&L yet. | 0.0% |

**Table F44. Respondents Type of Training Received, *N* = 52**

| **Please describe the type of training you received on ET&L. (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Webinar and online training provided by Thinkgate and ESE | 61.5% |
| Face-to-face spring 2013 training for pilot districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE | 26.9% |
| Face-to-face training provided by my district | 25.0% |
| Self-paced training using Thinkgate University | 21.2% |
| Face-to-face training for other districts provided by Thinkgate and ESE | 15.4% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**Table F45. Survey Responses on Aspects of ET&L Trainings**

| **How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the ET&L training?** | ***N*** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Disagree** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| My ET&L trainer was well prepared. | 52 | 1.9% | 11.5% | 59.6% | 26.9% |
| The training had technical difficulties that hindered the presentation. | 51 | 3.9% | 49.0% | 33.3% | 13.7% |
| The training answered questions I had. | 51 | 2.0% | 23.5% | 64.7% | 9.8% |
| The training included information about the online training resources available in Thinkgate University. | 53 | 0.0% | 20.8% | 62.3% | 17.0% |
| The training prepared me to access the system (i.e., how to log in). | 53 | 5.7% | 15.1% | 62.3% | 17.0% |
| The training prepared me to use the system. | 53 | 7.5% | 26.4% | 54.7% | 11.3% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F46. Survey Responses on Time Spent in ET&L Trainings**

| **Please rate the amount of time spent on each component of ET&L in the training you received.** | ***N*** | **Too Little** | **About Right** | **Too Much** | **My training did not address this.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Assessment Tools | 52 | 40.4% | 53.8% | 3.8% | 1.9% |
| Curriculum (Instruction) Tools | 51 | 54.9% | 41.2% | 0.0% | 3.9% |
| Reporting | 51 | 37.3% | 60.8% | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| Digital Resource (PBS content) | 51 | 52.9% | 19.6% | 0.0% | 27.5% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F47. Interest in Future Training on Various Topics, *N* = 42**

| **Please identify any topics for which you would like to receive further training/resources. Check all that apply.** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| How to access digital content | 59.5% |
| How to generate reports based on assessments | 52.4% |
| How to use mapping tools | 42.9% |
| How to create an assessments | 38.1% |
| How to administer assessments | 38.1% |
| How to create a curriculum unit | 38.1% |
| How to create a curriculum resource | 33.3% |
| How to align assessments to standards | 31.0% |
| How to use vocational technical competency tracking resources | 19.0% |
| Other\* | 7.2% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\*None (2.4%), how to use with other databases (2.4%), how to all student data and all questions without restrictions (2.4%)

**Table F48. Awareness of Materials Available Through Thinkgate University, *N* = 48**

| **Are you aware of the training and reference materials available through Thinkgate University?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | 70.8% |
| No | 29.2% |

**Table F49. Suggestions for Improvement of ET&L Trainings, *N* = 17**

| **How can ET&L training(s) be improved?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| More face-to-face trainings should be offered, and/or they should be available in more locations (e.g., in local schools/districts and in all corners of the State). | 31.3% |
| Training should be more practical (i.e., target school/district needs and exemplar tasks) and less broad. | 18.8% |
| Training should incorporate more time for user practice. | 18.8% |
| Follow-up sessions and/or time for practice after initial training are needed. | 18.8% |
| Trainings should utilize a step-by-step approach and include step-by-step reference materials that trainees can take home. | 12.5% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**ET&L Users and Uses**

**Table F50. Use of ET&L Outside of Training, *N* = 50**

| **Have you started using ET&L outside of your training session?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | 50.0% |
| No | 50.0% |

**Table F51. Methods of Edwin Communications**

| **Please indicate Yes or No for the following statements.** | ***N*** | **Yes** | **No** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I regularly look at the Edwin Twitter feed. | 48 | 6.3% | 93.8% |
| I have visited ESE’s Edwin website. | 50 | 82.0% | 18.0% |
| I receive information about ET&L training opportunities from ESE and/or my district. | 49 | 79.6% | 20.4% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F52. Frequency of Use of Assessment Tools**

| **How often have you used the Student Assessment Tools to do the following this school year?** | ***N*** | **This Feature Not Available** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Create individual assessment items | 46 | 8.7% | 60.9% | 23.9% | 0.0% | 4.3% | 2.2% |
| Use MCAS items to create an assessment | 47 | 6.4% | 66.0% | 17.0% | 4.3% | 4.3% | 2.1% |
| Use NWEA items to create an assessment | 46 | 13.0% | 71.7% | 10.9% | 0.0% | 2.2% | 2.2% |
| Use Key Data Systems items to create an assessment | 46 | 13.0% | 78.3% | 2.2% | 4.3% | 0.0% | 2.2% |
| Use other (third-party) items to create an assessment | 45 | 6.7% | 68.9% | 13.3% | 6.7% | 2.2% | 2.2% |
| Generate standard data reports (e.g., distractor analysis, Standards by Student) | 47 | 8.5% | 61.7% | 12.8% | 14.9% | 4.3% | 4.3% |
| Track vocational/technical competencies | 44 | 11.4% | 88.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F53. Amount of Assessment Content Created in ET&L, *N* = 47**

| **How much assessment content have you created in ET&L? Estimate the number of individual assessment items you have saved in the system.** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| None | 59.6% |
| Fewer than 10 | 27.7% |
| 10–99 | 8.5% |
| 100–199 | 2.1% |
| More than 200 | 2.1% |

**Table F54. Whole Assessments Saved in ET&L, *N* = 48**

| **Estimate the number of whole assessments you have saved in ET&L.** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| None | 58.3% |
| Fewer than 2 | 14.6% |
| 3–5 | 4.2% |
| 6–9 | 8.3% |
| More than 10 | 14.6% |

**Table F55. Assessments Shared With Other Educators, *N* = 49**

| **Estimate the number of assessments you have share with other educators in your district.** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| None | 71.4% |
| Fewer than 2 | 4.1% |
| 3–5 | 6.1% |
| 6–9 | 6.1% |
| More than 10 | 12.2% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F56. Ease of Use of Assessment Tools**

| **How difficult or straightforward is it to do the following in the Student Assessment Tools?** | ***N*** | **Very Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Neither Straight- forward Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Straight- forward** | **Very Straight- forward** | **NA/ Never Used** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Create individual assessment items | 44 | 4.8% | 23.8% | 23.8% | 28.6% | 19.0% | 52.3% |
| Use MCAS items to create an assessment | 44 | 5.3% | 15.8% | 21.1% | 31.6% | 26.3% | 56.8% |
| Use NWEA items to create an assessment | 44 | 6.3% | 12.5% | 18.8% | 43.8% | 18.8% | 63.6% |
| Use Key Data Systems items to create an assessment | 44 | 9.1% | 18.2% | 27.3% | 18.2% | 27.3% | 75.0% |
| Use other (third party) items to create an assessment | 43 | 7.1% | 28.6% | 21.4% | 14.3% | 28.6% | 67.4% |
| Generate standard data reports (e.g., distractor analysis, standards by student) | 44 | 4.3% | 21.7% | 17.4% | 34.8% | 21.7% | 47.7% |
| Track vocational/technical competencies | 40 | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 95.0% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100. Easy to difficult options are calculated out of the sample who indicated use; *N* excludes those who responded NA.

**Table F57. Frequency of Use of Data From Assessment Tools**

| **How often have you used the data from the Student Assessment Tools to do the following this school year?** | ***N*** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Identify individual students who need remedial assistance | 45 | 64.4% | 20.0% | 8.9% | 4.4% | 2.2% |
| Identify individual students who need extensions or challenges | 45 | 73.3% | 11.1% | 8.9% | 4.4% | 2.2% |
| Identify student groups for instruction | 44 | 68.2% | 13.6% | 11.4% | 4.5% | 2.3% |
| Identify and correct gaps in the curriculum for all students | 45 | 73.3% | 17.8% | 2.2% | 4.4% | 2.2% |
| Create of modify benchmark assessments | 45 | 71.1% | 15.6% | 6.7% | 4.4% | 2.2% |
| Align assessments with State standards | 45 | 73.3% | 15.6% | 4.4% | 4.4% | 2.2% |
| Adjust instructional strategy or learning format | 44 | 81.8% | 4.5% | 6.8% | 4.5% | 2.3% |
| Align curriculum with State standards | 45 | 75.6% | 17.8% | 2.2% | 2.2% | 2.2% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F58. Use of Assessment Tool Data/Reports With Others, *N* = 44**

| **With which of the following people did you review or discuss data/reports from ET&L Student Assessment Tools this school year? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| School administrators | 56.8% |
| Team leaders/coaches | 54.5% |
| Teachers | 45.5% |
| Not applicable | 31.8% |
| Students | 6.8% |
| Parents | 2.3% |
| Other (no one) | 2.3% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

**Table F59. Barriers to Use of Assessment Tools**

| **To what extent does each of the following represent a barrier to your use of ET&L Student Assessment Tools?** | ***N*** | **An Extensive Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **Not a Barrier** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I already use another system to create assessments and review student data (e.g., Galileo or TestWiz). | 43 | 4.7% | 23.3% | 14.0% | 58.1% |
| I don’t yet understand how to create assessments in ET&L. | 43 | 14.0% | 18.6% | 23.3% | 44.2% |
| I do not know how to access to test items outside the target grade level or subject area. | 42 | 11.9% | 16.7% | 23.8% | 47.6% |
| I cannot find test items appropriate for the target subject area. | 41 | 14.6% | 14.6% | 22.0% | 48.8% |
| I struggle to understand the information in the Student Assessment reports. | 40 | 5.0% | 10.0% | 12.5% | 72.5% |
| The Student Assessment Tools are not yet fully functional. | 39 | 10.3% | 30.8% | 15.4% | 43.6% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F60. Frequency of Use of Curriculum Tools**

| **How often do you use the Curriculum Tools to do the following?** | ***N*** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Utilize Model Curriculum Units available from ESE | 45 | 75.6% | 15.6% | 4.4% | 2.2% | 2.2% |
| Search for instructional materials by standard | 44 | 79.5% | 9.1% | 6.8% | 2.3% | 2.3% |
| Plan/schedule curriculum delivery | 43 | 86.0% | 4.7% | 4.7% | 2.3% | 2.3% |

**Table F61. Ease of Use of Curriculum Tools**

| **How difficult or straightforward was it to do the following in the Curriculum Tools?** | ***N*** | **Very Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Neither Straight- forward Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Straight- forward** | **Very Straight- forward** | **NA/ Never Used** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Utilize the Model Curriculum available from ESE | 45 | 5.3% | 10.5% | 5.3% | 47.4% | 31.6% | 57.8% |
| Search for instructional materials by standard | 45 | 5.9% | 11.8% | 11.8% | 41.2% | 29.4% | 62.2% |
| Plan/schedule curriculum delivery | 44 | 13.3% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 40.0% | 26.7% | 65.9% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100. Easy to difficult options are calculated out of the sample who indicated use; *N* excludes those who responded NA.

**Table F62. Barriers to Use of Curriculum Tools**

| **To what extent do the following statements represent a barrier to your school’s use of ET&L Curriculum Tools?** | ***N*** | **An Extensive Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **Not a Barrier** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The district’s priorities for ET& L do not emphasize Curriculum Tools. | 37 | 24.3% | 16.2% | 10.8% | 48.6% |
| I already use another system to plan units and lessons. | 37 | 16.2% | 29.7% | 13.5% | 40.5% |
| I do not yet understand how to use the Curriculum Tools. | 39 | 25.6% | 20.5% | 12.8% | 41.0% |
| I do not know how to modify lessons in the Model Curriculum Units. | 38 | 21.1% | 18.4% | 10.5% | 50.0% |
| The Model Curriculum Units do not pertain to my grade level or subject area. | 36 | 5.6% | 16.7% | 5.6% | 72.2% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F63. Frequency of Use of Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media)**

| **How often do you use the Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media) to do the following?** | ***N*** | **Never** | **Once or Twice This Year** | **A Few Times per Semester** | **A Few Times per Month** | **A Few Times per Week** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Review digital resources that are available | 44 | 79.5% | 11.4% | 4.5% | 0.0% | 4.5% |
| Link digital resources while creating an assessment or instructional resource in ET&L | 44 | 86.4% | 4.5% | 2.3% | 2.3% | 4.5% |
| Include digital resources in a lesson plan | 43 | 81.4% | 9.3% | 4.7% | 0.0% | 4.7% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F64. Ease of Use of Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media)**

| **How difficult or easy was it to do the following in the Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media)?** | ***N*** | **Very Easy** | **Moderately Easy** | **Neither Easy Nor Difficult** | **Moderately Difficult** | **Very Difficult** | **NA/ Never Used** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Review digital resources that are available | 43 | 41.7% | 33.3% | 16.7% | 8.3% | 0.0% | 72.1% |
| Link digital resources while creating an assessment or instructional resource in ET&L | 44 | 22.2% | 55.6% | 0.0% | 22.2% | 0.0% | 79.5% |
| Include digital resources in a lesson plan | 41 | 33.3% | 33.3% | 11.1% | 22.2% | 0.0% | 78.0% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100. Easy to difficult options are calculated out of the sample who indicated use; *N* excludes those who responded NA.

**Table F65. Barriers to Use of Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media)**

| **To what extent do the following statements represent a barrier to your school’s use of ET&L Digital Resources (PBS Learning Media)?** | ***N*** | **Not a Barrier** | **A Slight Barrier** | **A Moderate Barrier** | **An Extensive Barrier** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I have difficulty finding Digital Resources to support my work. | 34 | 58.8% | 20.6% | 11.8% | 8.8% |
| The Digital Resources available are not relevant to the subject matter I am teaching. | 34 | 64.7% | 17.6% | 11.8% | 5.9% |
| The videos in the Digital Resources don’t work when I try to use them. | 34 | 73.5% | 11.8% | 5.9% | 8.8% |
| I am unable to link Digital Resources where I want to use them (e.g., linking a video to a lesson plan or other document). | 35 | 68.6% | 11.4% | 8.6% | 11.4% |

**Table F66. Factors Supporting Use of ET&L**

| **To what extent is each of the following supporting your school’s use of ET&L?** | ***N*** | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School leaders encourage its use. | 43 | 18.6% | 32.6% | 44.2% | 4.7% |
| Teachers help each other use the system. | 41 | 39.0% | 34.1% | 22.0% | 4.9% |
| School leaders provide time for teachers to use the system. | 40 | 42.5% | 45.0% | 7.5% | 5.0% |
| There is a person in my school or district that helps teachers use the system. | 41 | 19.5% | 34.1% | 36.6% | 9.8% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F67. Perceived Benefits of ET&L**

| **Please rate your agreement with each of the following statements about ET&L:** | ***N*** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Disagree** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** | **Don’t Know/ NA** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The inclusion of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core in the system is a useful feature. | 45 | 2.2% | 2.2% | 37.8% | 37.8% | 20.0% |
| The multiple functionalities in ET&L make it more convenient than other tools. | 45 | 6.7% | 22.2% | 31.1% | 15.6% | 24.4% |
| The availability of digital (PBS) content is a useful feature. | 45 | 6.7% | 4.4% | 35.6% | 24.4% | 28.9% |
| ET&L is encouraging teachers in my school to share information and resources. | 43 | 0.0% | 27.9% | 20.9% | 9.3% | 41.9% |
| ET&L is consistent with other Statewide initiatives. | 44 | 4.5% | 9.1% | 54.5% | 6.8% | 25.0% |
| ET&L saves me time. | 43 | 16.3% | 16.3% | 37.2% | 4.7% | 25.6% |
| ET&L is more user friendly than other similar tools I have used. | 41 | 17.1% | 26.8% | 14.6% | 4.9% | 36.6% |
| ET&L is worth the investment of $2.50–$6.00 per pupil. | 42 | 28.6% | 23.8% | 16.7% | 2.4% | 28.6% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

**Table F68. Other Supports of, or Barriers to, Use of ET&L *N* = 14**

| **Please describe any other condition that supports or hinders your use of ET&L.** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Contents of system are frequently out-of-date (i.e., standards missing, incorrect student lists, SIF not working). | 21.4% |
| The cost is a hindrance. | 21.4% |
| Insufficient hardware (computer access and scanners) is a hindrance. | 14.3% |
| Limited software functionality is a hindrance. | 14.3% |
| The number of initiatives from the State and school districts strains time and resources. | 14.3% |
| Lack of Thinkgate troubleshooting/technical support hinders use. | 7.1% |
| Lack of time for training hinders use. | 7.1% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

III. Edwin Analytics Survey Frequency Tables

**Respondent Background**

**Table F69. Survey Respondents’ Primary Job Role, *N* = 147**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **How would you define your primary job role? (Choose one.)** | **Percentage** |
| Principal | 23.1% |
| Curriculum coordinator | 12.2% |
| Assistant principal | 7.5% |
| General education teacher | 7.5% |
| District technology/data coordinator | 7.5% |
| Other district administrator | 4.8% |
| School academic coach | 4.1% |
| Assistant superintendent | 2.7% |
| Special education teacher | 2.7% |
| District data coach | 2.0% |
| School data coach | 2.0% |
| Special education coordinator | 2.0% |
| District academic coach | 1.4% |
| District technology coach | 1.4% |
| Superintendent | 1.4% |
| Career, vocational, and technical education teacher (CVTE) | 0.7% |
| School technology coach | 0.0% |
| English language learner (ELL) teacher | 0.0% |
| Dual language learner (DLL) teacher | 0.0% |
| English as a second language (ESL) teacher | 0.0% |
| School technology/data coordinator | 0.0% |
| Other role (Please specify.)\* | 23.1% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

\*Other district administrator (4.8%), guidance counselor (3.4%), instructional leader (8.8%), other school administrator (6.1%)

**Definition and Communication of Edwin Analytics Goals, Timelines, and Expected Uses**

**Table F70. District and State Communication of the Purpose of Edwin Analytics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?** | ***N*** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Disagree** | **Neutral** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** |
| The State has clearly communicated the purpose of Edwin Analytics. | 142 | 1.4% | 15.5% | 28.2% | 43.7% | 11.3% |
| The district has clearly communicated the purpose of Edwin Analytics. | 141 | 0.7% | 14.9% | 27.0% | 49.6% | 7.8% |

**Table F71. Major Purposes of Edwin Analytics as Expressed by the State, *N* = 138**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Which of the following are the major purposes of the Edwin Analytics as expressed by the State? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| Giving educators a more comprehensive view of students, teachers, schools, districts and the State | 76.8% |
| Providing tools and resources that will help educators improve teaching and learning | 66.7% |
| Providing tools and resources that will help educators improve education outcomes | 59.4% |
| Providing timely and actionable information | 50.0% |
| Decreasing achievement gaps | 42.8% |
| Providing tools and resources that will help educators improve school readiness | 32.6% |
| Other (Please specify.)\* | 3.6% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\* Align curriculum to the frameworks (0.7%), don’t know (0.7%), improve MCAS performance (0.7%), providing administration with tools to help show patterns (0.7%), PLCs within schools and throughout the district (0.7%)

**Table F72. Major Purposes of Edwin Analytics as Expressed by the District, *N* = 137**

| **Which of the following are the major purposes of Edwin Analytics as expressed by your district? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Tracking assessment results | 85.4% |
| Identifying achievement gaps | 78.1% |
| Identifying gaps in curriculum | 60.6% |
| Providing early intervention for students who are struggling | 43.1% |
| Understanding if students are ready for college | 13.1% |
| Understanding how past students have done in postsecondary education | 8.8% |
| Understanding if students are ready for school (in Grades K–3) | 6.6% |
| Understanding district finances | 4.4% |
| Other (Please specify.)\* | 3.6% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\* None (2.9%), teacher evaluation (0.7%)

**Table F73. District Expected Use of Edwin Analytics Reports, *N* = 138**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Which of the following types of reports from Edwin Analytics does your district expect you to use? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| Student growth analysis | 85.5% |
| Item analysis | 81.9% |
| Achievement analysis | 75.4% |
| Early warning indicators (EWIS) | 42.8% |
| Curriculum analysis | 38.4% |
| Classroom analysis | 38.4% |
| Enrollment indicators (attendance, demographics, educational environment, retention, suspension) | 30.4% |
| Postsecondary analysis | 12.3% |
| Staffing indicators | 10.1% |
| Financial indicators | 6.5% |
| Other (Please specify.)\* | 2.9% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\* None (1.4%), reports about MCAS and students that have yet to take or pass it (0.7%), teacher transitions and demographics (0.7%)

**Table F74. Types of Edwin Communications**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Please indicate Yes or No for the following statements.** | ***N*** | **Yes** | **No** |
| I received information about Edwin Analytics training opportunities from ESE and/or my district. | 138 | 71.0% | 29.0% |
| I received information about Edwin Analytics webinars. | 138 | 55.8% | 44.2% |
| I received information about Edwin Analytics EWIS video tutorials. | 133 | 42.1% | 57.9% |
| I have visited ESE’s Edwin website. | 138 | 86.2% | 13.8% |

**Edwin Analytics Users and Uses**

**Table F75. Frequency of Use of Edwin Analytics System, *N* = 140**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **How often have you used Edwin Analytics in the past year?** | **Percentage** |
| Never | 3.6% |
| Occasionally | 35.7% |
| Somewhat frequently | 29.3% |
| Very frequently | 31.4% |

**Table F76. Time of Use of Edwin Analytics, *N* = 135**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **When do you typically use Edwin Analytics? (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| At the beginning of the school year | 72.6% |
| In the summer before the school year starts | 61.5% |
| As data are updated in the system | 60.0% |
| Around benchmark or interim assessment administration | 31.9% |
| At the end of the quarter, around report card time | 19.3% |
| Other (Please specify.)\* | 10.4% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\*Never used (1.5%), ongoing as needed (6.7%), EPIMS, SCS, etc. district data requirements for DESE (0.7%), when reviewing MCAS data (1.5%)

**Table F77. Frequency of Use of Edwin Analytics Components**

| **Please rate the extent to which you use each of the following in Edwin Analytics.** | ***N*** | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Achievement analysis | 134 | 12.7% | 14.9% | 39.6% | 32.84% |
| Item analysis | 136 | 9.6% | 13.2% | 36.0% | 41.18% |
| Student growth analysis | 137 | 10.2% | 13.9% | 42.3% | 33.58% |
| Curriculum analysis | 126 | 34.9% | 19.8% | 31.0% | 14.29% |
| Early warning indicators (EWIS) | 124 | 33.1% | 41.1% | 21.0% | 4.84% |
| Postsecondary analysis | 119 | 71.4% | 25.2% | 1.7% | 1.68% |
| Classroom analysis | 127 | 41.7% | 22.8% | 23.6% | 11.81% |
| Enrollment indicators (attendance, demographics, educational environment, retention, suspension) | 127 | 45.7% | 29.9% | 21.3% | 3.15% |
| Staffing indicators | 121 | 69.4% | 24.8% | 5.0% | 0.83% |
| District-determined measures | 125 | 63.2% | 20.8% | 11.2% | 4.80% |
| District finances | 120 | 81.7% | 15.8% | 2.5% | 0.00% |

**Table F78. Extent of Use of Edwin Analytics Data for Various Purposes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent do you use data in Edwin Analytics for each of the following purposes?** | ***N*** | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| To track assessment results | 138 | 13.0% | 10.9% | 31.2% | 44.9% |
| To identify individual students who are off track for graduation | 130 | 42.3% | 20.0% | 22.3% | 15.4% |
| To identify individual students who need remedial assistance | 134 | 16.4% | 24.6% | 28.4% | 30.6% |
| To identify and correct gaps in the curriculum for all students | 134 | 24.6% | 21.6% | 32.1% | 21.6% |
| To identify achievement gaps | 137 | 19.0% | 15.3% | 39.4% | 26.3% |
| To track expenditures and resource allocation | 122 | 78.7% | 16.4% | 4.9% | 0.0% |

**Table F79. Use of Edwin Analytics Data With Others, *N* = 140**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Do you discuss data pulled from Edwin Analytics with other staff in your school or district?** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 87.9% |
| No | 12.1% |

**Table F80. Methods of Use of Edwin Analytics Data With Others, *N* = 123**

| **Please indicate the ways you discuss data pulled from Edwin Analytics with other staff in your school or district. (Check all that apply.)** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| In leadership team meetings | 74.0% |
| In grade-level meetings | 67.5% |
| In content area or department meetings | 67.5% |
| In district-level meetings | 66.7% |
| Informally between teachers | 56.1% |
| Other (Please specify.)\* | 6.5% |

*Note:* Percentages may exceed 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

\* As needed in response to data requests (0.8%), at school committee meetings (1.6%), during professional development workshops (0.8%), formal meetings with teachers (2.4%), principals retreat and DSAC assistance personnel (0.8%)

**Table F81. Extent to Which Edwin Analytics Meets Data Analysis Needs, *N* = 135**

| **To what extent does Edwin Analytics meet your data analysis needs?** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Not at all | 2.2% |
| Minimally | 20.0% |
| Moderately | 54.8% |
| Extensively | 23.0% |

**Factors and Conditions That Support or Hinder Use of Edwin Analytics**

**Table F82. Factors Supporting Use of Edwin Analytics**

| **Please rate the extent to which each of the following supports your use of Edwin Analytics.** | ***N*** | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School and district leaders provide time for use of Edwin Analytics. | 135 | 14.8% | 37.8% | 37.0% | 10.4% |
| School and district leaders provide ongoing training for use of Edwin Analytics. | 135 | 38.5% | 37.0% | 20.0% | 4.4% |
| School and district leaders encourage collaboration with other staff on the use of Edwin Analytics. | 135 | 19.3% | 36.3% | 34.8% | 9.6% |
| School and district leaders encourage staff to use Edwin Analytics to help in decreasing achievement gaps. | 135 | 21.5% | 34.1% | 28.1% | 16.3% |

**Table F83. Barriers to Use of Edwin Analytics**

| **To what extent does each of the following represent a barrier to your  use of Edwin Analytics?** | ***N*** | **Not at All** | **Minimally** | **Moderately** | **Extensively** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I didn’t receive sufficient training on how to use Edwin Analytics. | 132 | 27.3% | 35.6% | 25.8% | 11.4% |
| Edwin Analytics is not user-friendly. | 133 | 24.8% | 40.6% | 25.6% | 9.0% |
| I don’t understand the meaning of the different reports. | 134 | 39.6% | 41.8% | 14.9% | 3.7% |
| The reports in the system are not the ones I need. | 133 | 38.3% | 42.1% | 15.0% | 4.5% |
| The data are provided too late to be useful. | 132 | 28.8% | 40.2% | 23.5% | 7.6% |
| The data in Edwin Analytics are inaccurate. | 130 | 69.2% | 26.2% | 3.1% | 1.5% |
| I don’t have sufficient time to think about the available data. | 130 | 29.2% | 32.3% | 30.0% | 8.5% |
| I already use another system to review student data (e.g., Galileo or TestWiz). | 131 | 67.2% | 18.3% | 9.9% | 4.6% |
| Edwin Analytics is not connected to other Statewide initiatives. | 119 | 54.6% | 35.3% | 6.7% | 3.4% |

**Table F84. Other Supports of, or Barrier to, Use of Edwin Analytics, *N* = 35**

| **Please describe any other condition that supports or hinders your use of Edwin Analytics.** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- |
| Edwin Analytics is not user-friendly, hindering use. | 28.6% |
| Time is needed to use and to practice using Edwin Analytics. | 17.1% |
| Edwin Analytics lacks functions that would support use. | 11.4% |
| Lack of up-to-date or accurate data hinders use. | 11.4% |
| Users lack sufficient training. | 11.4% |
| I use another program that meets my needs. | 8.6% |
| Users’ lack of access to the system or the lack of access of their colleagues | 5.7% |
| Other | 5.7% |

*Note:* As a result of rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

# Appendix G. Focus Group Protocols

I. Teacher Focus Group Protocol

Hello, my name is *[your name]*, and this is *[your cofacilitator/note taker’s name]*. Thanks again for taking the time to speak with me this morning/afternoon. Before we start, I’d like to provide a little background on our work, and answer any questions you might have for me.

I work for American Institutes for Research/Evidence-Based Education Research & Evaluation (EBERE). We are working on a project for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to learn more about how districts are using the Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics systems. This information will help inform any possible changes to the systems and trainings for the systems to make them more useful to Massachusetts educators.

Before we begin, there are a few things I would like to discuss with you. First, we will keep everything you tell us confidential. This means we will never use your name or say that you said anything when we report our findings. Please be assured that we will not repeat anything you say today to anyone other than our research team who is responsible for analyzing the data and writing a report about our findings.

Second, there are no right or wrong answers; we are seeking what you know to be facts, and we are also seeking your opinions, so share with us to the best of your ability. We would like to learn as much as we can about both Edwin Teaching & Learning and Edwin Analytics, so we will ask you questions about both. I realize you may be more familiar with just one of the systems, but let me know whatever you can about each of them. **Recently the Department rebranded the Education Data Warehouse, and it is now known as Edwin Analytics. Edwin Analytics includes Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) reports, the Early Warning Indicator System reports, and Postsecondary Reports**.

Because we would like to capture all of the information you provide in a coherent way, we would like your permission to record the interview so that we capture all the information verbatim. This recording will be shared only with the research team, will be stored in a secure server, and will be destroyed after the study. If there is anything you will like to have off the record, please let us know, and we will not record it. Is it okay to move forward with recording the discussion?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

|  |
| --- |
| ***Note to interviewer****: Throughout the interview, be sure to distinguish between Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics. If you are unsure about which system the interviewee is referring to, be sure to clarify.* |

**Background/Context** (*Spend minimal time on this section*)

1. Please describe your role in the school and how you’ve used ET&L so far.
2. Do you have access to Edwin Analytics? Do you know someone who does?

**Goals and Expectations for the Edwin Systems**

1. What is your understanding of the goals and expectations for teachers’ use of ET&L?

*Probe: Who communicated these to you? How were they communicated*

*Probe: Do any of these expectations relate to addressing achievement gaps?*

1. What is your understanding of the goals and expectations for teachers’ use of Edwin Analytics?

*Probe: Who communicated these to you? How were they communicated*

*Probe: Do any of these expectations relate to addressing achievement gaps?*

**Training**

1. Please describe the training the district provided for ET&L.

*Probe:*

* *When did you receive training?*
* *Who was trained in your school how were they selected?*
* *Was the training mandatory?*
* *What was the format (e.g., did the trainer provide direct training or were Thinkgate University training modules used)?*
* *Did you encounter any barriers while training (e.g., technical issues, not enough computers, insufficient time)?*
* *In your opinion, was the training adequate to allow teachers and staff to successfully use ET&L?*
* *Do you have suggestions for how to improve ET&L training?*
* *In your opinion, did the trainers have adequate materials and knowledge to train you? If not, what was lacking?*

1. Was there any training provided for Edwin Analytics?

*Probe:*

* *Who received the training, and how were they chosen to receive it? Was it mandatory?*
* *Who provided the training?*
* *What was the format?*
* *Did you encounter any barriers while training (e.g., technical issues, not enough computers, insufficient time)?*
* *Do you have suggestions for how to improve Analytics training?*
* *In your opinion, was the training adequate to allow teachers and staff to successfully use Analytics?*

**Current Use and Monitoring of Edwin Systems**

1. Please describe how you use ET&L.

*Probe:*

* *How often do you use it?*
* *What do you primarily use it for?*
* *Which features do you use most?*
* *Do you use it to inform strategies for closing the achievement gap for low-income and minority students, and second language learners? If you don’t currently use ET&L for this purpose, can you envision how the system could be useful for this purpose?*

1. [If applicable] Please describe how you use Analytics.

*Probe:*

* *How often do you use it?*
* *What do you primarily use it for?*
* *Which features do you use most?*
* *Do you use it to inform strategies for closing the achievement gap for low-income and minority students, and second language learners?*
* *Do you ever use it in conjunction with ET&L, and if so, how?*

1. What other data or assessment systems do you currently use or have you used in the past?
2. How do they compare to ET&L and/or Edwin Analytics?

*Probe: usability, assessment capabilities, curriculum capabilities, training/help, content*

**Assessment of the Edwin Systems**

***Successes***

1. What successes have you encountered with ET&L?

*Probe: What do you think are the most helpful components of ET&L?*

1. What successes have you encountered with Edwin Analytics?

*Probe: What do you think are the most helpful components of Analytics?*

***Challenges***

1. What challenges have you encountered with ET&L?

*Probe: How could the system be improved?*

1. What improvements would you make to ET&L?
2. What challenges have you encountered with Analytics?

*Probe: How could the system be improved?*

1. What improvements would you make to Analytics?

**Support for Use of Edwin Systems**

1. How do school leaders support your use of ET&L?

*Probe:*

* *Does your district or school have a person who acts as a coordinator, facilitator, or coach to support ET&L use? In what way does this person provide support?*
* *Does your district or school have an instructional support person who helps teachers with ET&L? What is their role?*
* *Is there scheduled meeting time to plan ET&L use? To collaborate on developing assessments or lesson plans in ET&L?*
* *Does your principal support your use of ET&L? How?*

1. How do school leaders support your use of Analytics?

*Probe:*

* *Does your district or school have a person who acts as a coordinator, facilitator, or coach to support data use? In what way does this person provide support?*
* *Does your school provide staff with scheduled meeting time to review Edwin data in the Analytics system? What in particular are the goals of these meetings? (Probe for focus on achievement gaps, differentiated instruction, etc.).*
* *Does your principal support your use of Analytics? In what ways?*

II. School Administrator Focus Group Protocol

Hello, my name is *[your name]*, and this is *[your cofacilitator/note taker’s name]*. Thanks again for taking the time to speak with me this morning/afternoon. Before we start, I’d like to provide a little background on our work, and answer any questions you might have for me.

I work for American Institutes for Research/Evidence-Based Education Research & Evaluation (EBERE). We are working on a project for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to learn more about how districts are using the Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics systems. This information will help inform any possible changes to the systems and trainings for the systems to make them more useful to Massachusetts educators.

Before we begin, there are a few things I would like to discuss with you. First, we will keep everything you tell us confidential. This means we will never use your name or say that you said anything when we report our findings. Please be assured that we will not repeat anything you say today to anyone other than our research team who is responsible for analyzing the data and writing a report about our findings.

Second, there are no right or wrong answers; we are seeking what you know to be facts, and we are also seeking your opinions, so share with us to the best of your ability. We would like to learn as much as we can about both Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics, so we will ask you questions about both. I realize you may be more familiar with just one of the systems, but let me know whatever you can about each of them. **Recently the Department rebranded the Education Data Warehouse, and it is now known as Edwin Analytics. Edwin Analytics includes Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) reports, the Early Warning Indicator System reports, and Postsecondary Reports**.

Because we would like to capture all of the information you provide in a coherent way, we would like your permission to record the interview so that we capture all the information verbatim. This recording will be shared only with the research team, will be stored in a secure server, and will be destroyed after the study. If there is anything you will like to have off the record, please let us know, and we will not record it. Is it okay to move forward with recording the discussion?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

|  |
| --- |
| ***Note to interviewer****: Throughout the interview, be sure to distinguish between Edwin Teaching and Learning and Edwin Analytics. If you are unsure about which system the interviewee is referring to, be sure to clarify.* |

**Background/Context** (*Spend minimal time on this section*)

1. Can you please briefly describe your role in the school, and what your involvement with the rollout of ET&L has been?
2. Does anyone in your school use Edwin Analytics? If so, who?

**Goals and Expectations for the Edwin Systems**

***ET&L***

1. How does ET&L fit into your district’s goals?

*Probe: How are these goals communicated with schools/teachers? Who communicates them?*

1. What are your expectations for how ET&L should be used by teachers and other staff?

*Probe:*

* *How would you describe “ideal” use of ET&L for teachers? For administrators?*
* *Have these expectations changed since you started using it?*
* *Do any of these expectations relate to addressing achievement gaps?*
* *How have you communicated these expectations to staff?*

***Analytics***

1. How does Edwin Analytics fit into your district’s goals?

*Probe: How are these goals communicated with schools/teachers? Who communicates them?*

1. *If teachers are using Analytics:* What are your expectations for how Analytics should be used by teachers and other staff?

*If teachers are not using Analytics:* What are your expectations for Analytics use in your school?

*Probe:*

* *How would you describe “ideal” use of Analytics?*
* *Have these expectations changed since you started using it?*
* *Do any of these expectations relate to addressing achievement gaps?*
* *How have you communicated these expectations to staff?*

**Use of Data Systems & Technology**

***ET&L***

1. Is your district using any curriculum planning systems besides ET&L?
2. Is your district using any computer-based assessment systems besides ET&L?

*If yes, probe for which ones and how widely they are still used.* *Probe for how ET&L compares to other systems.*

***Analytics***

1. Is your district using any other data systems besides Analytics?

*If yes, probe for which ones and how widely they are still used.* *Probe for how Analytics compares with other systems.*

**Training**

***ET&L***

1. Please describe the training the district provided for ET&L.

*Probe:*

* *Who was trained in your school, and how were they selected?*
* *Was the training mandatory? Paid?*
* *Was it part of the district’s overall professional development plan?*
* *What was the format (e.g., did the trainer provide direct training or were Thinkgate University training modules used)?*
* *Did you encounter any barriers while training (e.g., technical issues, not enough computers, insufficient time)?*
* *In your opinion, was the training adequate to allow teachers and staff to successfully use ET&L for the goals/purposes of your district?*
* *What is the district/school’s plan for people who haven’t received training?*
* *Given the district’s goals for ET&L, are there training issues/barriers that need to be resolved to help your district use ET&L to reach these goals?*

***Analytics***

1. Was there any training provided for Edwin Analytics?

*Probe:*

* *Who received the training, and how were they selected?*
* *Was the training mandatory? Paid?*
* *Was it part of the district’s overall professional development plan?*
* *Who provided the training?*
* *In your opinion, was the training adequate to allow teachers and staff to successfully use Analytics?*
* *What is the district/school’s plan for people who haven’t received training?*

**Current Use and Monitoring of Edwin Systems**

***ET&L***

1. Please describe the ways in which ET&L is currently used among staff in your school.

*Probe:*

* *Who is using it?*
* *Is ET&L used (or planned for use) to develop curriculum (lesson plans, curriculum units, curriculum maps)?*
* *Is ET&L used (or planned for use) to develop or administer assessments?*
* *Are data from ET&L assessments used to inform instruction? Interventions/ supports for students?*
* *Are data from ET&L used to inform strategies for closing the achievement gap for low-income and minority students, and second language learners?*

1. Which features of ET&L do teachers use the most? Why? Administrators?

*Probe:*

* *Does this usage follow the district’s plan/goals?*
* *If not, does usage reflect teacher initiative, or the tools that are most needed by teachers, or those that are easiest to use, or other factor?*

1. Are staff in your district using Edwin Teaching and Learning as planned (considering where you are in your implementation)?

*Probe:*

* *How do you know? (e.g., are data being utilized as expected, are planned instructional responses effective?)*
* *Is there a structure in place to review use of the system?*
* *How do you identify barriers to planned use?*

***Analytics***

1. Please describe the ways in which Analytics is currently used among staff in your school.

*Probe:*

* *Who is using it?*
* *Is it used to inform how classes are formed? Groupings within classes? Priorities for teacher professional development? Decisions about interventions?*
* *Is it used to inform strategies for closing the achievement gap for low-income and minority students, and second language learners?*

1. Do most people use both ET&L and Analytics?
2. Do they use the systems in conjunction with each other or entirely separately? (i.e., do they integrate the use, or do they use each for different purposes and at different times?)

**Assessment of the Edwin Systems**

***Successes***

1. What successes have you encountered with ET&L?

*Probe: What do you think are the most helpful components of ET&L?*

1. What successes have you encountered with Edwin Analytics?

*Probe: What do you think are the most helpful components of Analytics?*

***Challenges***

1. What challenges have you encountered with the initial rollout of ET&L?

*Probe: Have teachers encountered any technical difficulties or barriers?*

1. How would you recommend improving ET&L?
2. What challenges have you encountered with Analytics?

*Probe: Have teachers encountered any technical difficulties or barriers?*

1. How would you recommend improving Analytics?

**Support for Use of Edwin Systems**

***ET&L***

1. What types of information have you received about ET&L from ESE, and how was it delivered?

*Probe: Who provided the information you received (e.g., ESE or someone in your district)?* *Is there additional logistical information about ET&L that would be useful?*

1. What types of support for use of ET&L are available to staff?

*Probe:*

* *Does your district or school have a person who acts as a coordinator, facilitator, or coach to support ET&L use? In what way does this person provide support?*
* *Does your district or school have an instructional support person who helps teachers use the ET&L system?*
* *Is there scheduled meeting time to plan ET&L use, and/or to collaborate on developing assessments or lesson plans in ET&L?*
* *In what ways are district staff supporting schools in their use of ET&L?*

***Analytics***

1. What types of information have you received about Analytics from ESE, and how was it delivered?

*Probe: Who provided the information you received (e.g., ESE or someone in your district)? Is there additional logistical information about Analytics that would be useful?*

1. What types of support for use of Analytics is available to staff?

*Probe:*

* *Does your district or school have a person who acts as a coordinator, facilitator, or coach to support data use? In what way does this person support data use?*
* *Does your school provide staff with scheduled meeting time to review Edwin data in the Analytics system? What in particular are the goals of these meetings? (Probe for focus on achievement gaps, differentiated instruction, etc.).*
* *In what ways are district staff supporting schools in their use of Analytics?*

# Appendix H. Think-Aloud Protocol

Introduction

Hello, my name is *[your name]*, and this is *[your co-facilitator/note-taker’s name]*. Thanks again for taking the time to speak with me this morning/afternoon about the Edwin Analytics and Edwin Teaching and Learning systems and trainings.

I work for American Institutes for Research/Evidence-Based Education Research & Evaluation (EBERE). We are working on a project for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to learn more about how districts are using the Edwin Analytics and Edwin Teaching and Learning (ET&L) systems. This information will help inform any possible changes to the systems and trainings for the systems to make them more useful to Massachusetts educators.

Before we begin, there are a few things I would like to discuss with you. First, everything you tell us is confidential. This means we will never use your name or your school’s name when we report our findings. Please be assured that we will not repeat anything you say today to anyone other than our research team who is responsible for analyzing the data and writing a report about our findings.

Because we would like to capture all of the information you say in a coherent way, we would like your permission to record what you say. This recording will be shared only with the research team, will be stored in a secure server, and will be destroyed after the study. If there is anything you will like to have off the record, please let us know, and we will not record it. Is it okay to move forward with recording the discussion?

**Background (5 minutes)**

Let me start with a little background about this think-aloud observation. As part of this research project, we are trying to understand how teachers use and navigate ET&L and Edwin Analytics.

Today’s think-aloud will take about 60 minutes to complete and will consist of two parts. First, I’ll ask you to use Edwin as you normally would do. I may ask you for some specific feedback, but mostly I’ll just be listening to what you are saying as you think aloud. In the second part, I will ask you to navigate to specific parts of Edwin and ask you some questions about what you are thinking about what you see.

Since most people are not used to thinking out loud, I’d like to model a think-aloud for you and then ask you to do the same.

Suppose someone asked me: *How many hours of television have you watched in the past three days?*

Let me pretend that I’m answering this question: *PAUSE TO THINK. Well, today is [DAY] and I’ll count it as the first day. Let’s see—well, before work I usually spend about 15 minutes a day watching the news. Fifteen minutes times three is 45 minutes. But, today, I was watching for the weather to figure out what to wear, so I watched the TV for a few more minutes than usual, so I probably watched another 15 extra minutes. That’s another 15 minutes—so, that brings the total to 1 hour or 60 minutes, since the question asks for minutes—and that is just for morning TV watching*

*Okay, when I got home I watched a movie and that was about 90 minutes long. The night before I watched a couple of shows that are 30 minutes each so that’s another hour. This makes for two and a half hours of evening TV watching. Plus one hour of morning TV watching. Let’s see, at home—that’s too hard! Um, I also watched TV while I was at the gym on the elliptical machine; that was two days, and I was on the elliptical for 30 minutes each time, which is one more hour. This brings my total to four and a half hours of TV watching in the past three days. Oh, but the question asks for minutes so that’s 4.5 times 60, which equals 270 minutes.*

Do you have any questions before we start?

**Part I. Free Navigation (8–10 minutes)**

***Start the recording.***

What did you do last time you logged into Edwin? Please show me. The only difference is that today you will think aloud as you navigate the systems. So let’s get started by logging in.

Probes for general cognitive think-aloud process, to keep the respondent talking:

 *Can you tell me what you’re thinking while you do that?*

 *Why did you decide to look at that?*

 *What made you choose that option?*

 *What was your reasoning on that again? I just want to make sure I understand.*

 *Why did you choose to look at that page/information?*

 *Why did you choose to look at that student?*

 *Can you tell me how you decided to look at that data/resource/feature?*

***Note any barriers to using the technology here.***

Part II. Structured ET&L Scenarios (30 minutes)[[25]](#footnote-25)

First let’s start with navigating to the **main ET&L** **page** (the page you see when you first log in).

1. What information do you find most useful in this overview page?
2. Do you use the information in this overview page? How do you use it?
3. Is there anything missing from this page that would be helpful to you?
4. Can you describe which parts of ET&L you normally use?

Now I am going to ask you to look at specific pages and data in ET&L. Please continue to tell me what you are thinking out loud. We are trying to understand your thoughts about this system. If it’s a portion of ET&L that you don’t normally use or you are uncomfortable using, it would be great if you can try to use it anyway. This isn’t a test of how well you use ET&L, but rather an evaluation of how well ET&L serves educators.

***Scenario 1: Assessment (10 minutes)***

Please navigate to the Assessment feature of ET&L. Can you please show me how you create an assessment? Feel free to create any assessment for any purpose you wish. If it’s easier, it can be a “sample” assessment (rather than one you will actually use in class). *[If the respondent does not know how to get to the Assessment section, guide him or her there: Choose “Assessment” from the menu bar at the top of the page (near the respondent’s log-in name).]*

After **five** minutes (or after the respondent has completed the task):

1. Why did you choose this assessment-creation method (Make It Quick vs. Create My Own)?
2. If you were going to use the other method to create an assessment, what would you do differently?
3. What type of assessment (Make It Quick or Create My Own) do you usually do?
   1. How often?
   2. Why this type more than the other?
   3. Do you use an item bank?

*Probe: Which one(s) and why?*

* 1. Do you/have you created your own items in ET&L?
  2. How well does the ET&L assessment feature meet your needs?

*Probe: How does this compare with what you were using before?*

1. Now, what would you do next?

*Probe: Administer online? Print hard copies? Print bubble sheets?*

***Scenario 2: Reporting (10 minutes)***

Have you delivered assessments in ET&L? If so, do you normally use the reporting capabilities in ET&L? Have you been trained on ET&L reporting?

Please navigate to the Reporting feature of ET&L. Would you be able to show me an assessment report and walk me through the data? *[If the respondent does not know how to get to a report, guide him or her there: Choose “Reporting” from the menu bar at the top of the page (near the respondent’s log-in name). In Assessment Results, choose the Expand icon and enter criteria to choose an assessment. If the respondent hasn’t done an assessment, this feature may not be available, and then this portion of the think-aloud should be omitted.]*

Probe:

1. What kind of information do you look for in this kind of report? Talk me through how you look for this information.
2. Looking at the report data, what information can you learn about strengths and weaknesses of the class?

*Probe: Can you please talk a little bit more about what information shows you strengths and areas of needs?*

*Probe: Would you normally look at all the students here or just some? Which ones?*

*Probe: Do you compare students to each other on this page? Or look at the class as a whole?*

*Probe: Are there any “false” strengths or weaknesses shown?*

*Probe: Are there any surprises in the data?*

*Probe: Are you aware of the other versions of assessment reports that are available in ET&L?*

1. How do you use this information?

*Probe: Could/would you make any modifications to your classroom practices based on these data?*

1. Can you use any of the reporting data to help you address gaps in achievement in diverse populations? How?
2. Why did you choose this report? What other reports do you run?
3. How often do you use the reporting feature?
4. How well does the ET&L reporting feature meet your needs?

*Probe: Is there assessment information you need that you don’t see in the available ET&L reports? How does this compare with other systems you have used?*

***Scenario 3: Instruction (5–8 minutes)***

When was the last time you used the Instruction Capabilities in ET&L? Have you been trained on this feature?

Please navigate to the Instruction section of ET&L. Can you please show me which features of this section you use and how you use them? *[If the respondent does not know how to get to this section, guide him or her there: Choose “Instruction” from the menu bar at the top of the page (near the respondent’s log-in name). If the user and/or district haven’t used the curriculum capabilities, there won’t be anything to see, and then this section should be omitted.]*

For each feature shown (*curriculum maps, unit plan, lesson plan, model curriculum, resources*):

1. How often do you use this feature?
2. What do you use it for?
3. How does this feature differ from what you’ve used in the past?
4. How well does it meet your needs?

*Probe: How does this compare to other systems you have used?*

At the end of this scenario:

1. Are there features you don’t find useful? Why?

***Scenario 4: Resources (2–5 minutes)***

Now please navigate back to the **main ET&L** **page** (the page you see when you first log in). Please show me how you can get information or assistance with any of the features you showed me today. *[If the respondent does not navigate to the Reference Center under the Help menu on his or her own, ask the respondent to do so.]*

1. How did you learn about this resource?
2. How often do you use this resource?
3. How helpful is this resource to you?

*Probe: Do you find the information you need, or do you need to go elsewhere?*

1. Do you have any suggestions to improve it?

Part III. Structured Edwin Analytics Scenarios (20 minutes)[[26]](#footnote-26)

First, let’s start with navigating to the **main Analytics** **page** (the page you see when you first log in).

1. What information do you find most useful in this page?
2. How do you use the information in this page?
3. Is there anything missing from this page that would be helpful to you?

Now I am going to ask you to look for some specific items in Analytics. Please continue to think aloud as you navigate to them. *[Name items from this list one at a time. Mark the ones that the participant successfully navigated to and the ones the participant was unable to navigate to. Do not provide help; simply move to the next item.]*

* Are the MCAS achievement levels of your students consistent each year for the past three years?
* Please navigate to the MCAS cube and show me something you have done with it to analyze your data.
* *[Grade 3 teachers and above only]* In spring 2013, what percentage of your students got the MCAS “Reading Anchor Standard” questions correct?
* What percentage of your Grade 5 students with disabilities were in the “Very High” MCAS growth percentile in math in spring 2013?
* In the 2012–13 school year, what was the percentage of23 the special education students in your class?
  + How many do not have English as their primary language?
  + What is the most common special education placement for these students?
* What is the breakdown of EWIS high-, moderate-, and low-risk levels among students with disabilities in your class in the 2013–14 school year?
* What were the achievement results of your incoming students last year, and how did their achievement results change by the end of the year?

Questions:

1. Looking at the Analytics data, what can you determine about strengths and weaknesses of your students?

*Probe: Can you please talk a little bit more about how it shows you strengths and areas of needs?*

*Probe: Do you look at all the students here or just some? Which ones??*

*Probe: Do you compare students to each other? Or look at the class as a whole?*

*Probe: Are there any “false” strengths or weaknesses shown?*

*Probe: Are there any surprises in the data?*

1. Can you use any of the data to help you address gaps in achievement in diverse populations? How?
2. How well does Edwin Analytics meet your needs?

*Probe: How does this compare with what you were using before?*

1. Are there aspects or features of Edwin Analytics that could be improved? Why?

Part IV. Debriefing (2 minutes)

Well, that wraps up the structured portion of our observation today. Is there anything else you want to share with me about how you use or think about features of the two Edwin systems?

Thank you for your participation today. Your input is greatly appreciated!
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1. The face-to-face TTTs occurred prior to the evaluation time frame. Evaluation activities were therefore focused on the remote TTTs, although participants in the evaluation from pilot districts had participated in face-to-face TTTs. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Accounts were created for all educators in active districts, but districts were responsible for supplying log-in data to users for access, so it is possible that a large number of the account holders did not have access to the system. This figure is nonetheless an indication of low overall system usage. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. MCAS items are provided free of charge as part of the system. Districts may also choose to purchase Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) items or other third party item banks. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Fifteen teachers who were initially invited to participate could not be reached. These teachers were replaced with 15 randomly selected teachers from the district with many trainees. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Two administrators who were initially invited could not be reached. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. We excluded reports identified as SIMS Validation Error Reports and SIF Reports because their primary use is to determine if there are errors in the data before it is released to Edwin Analytics. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. One of these reviewers had conducted several observations of ET&L usage and had analyzed the Thinkgate University tutorial modules as part of this evaluation. The other reviewer also had reviewed the Thinkgate University tutorial modules as part of the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Designation as “active” distinguished key district ET&L contacts who were invited to speak during question periods, chat with the instructors during the webinars, and contact ESE or Thinkgate for ET&L assistance. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. We are unable to gauge systematically whether TTT participants did ultimately train others in their districts, and if not, whether this was a function of the TTT or some other factor (e.g., SIF inoperability, lack of district support for ET&L). However, we had difficulty finding districts in which training occurred after TTTs for follow-up observations as part of the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Recall that districts could invite as many people as they wished to attend the ET&L TTT webinars, but only three users could engage actively with the trainers through the phone, chat function, or post-training contact. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Contrary to our recruitment criteria that nominees had received training (see Methods section), 9 percent of teachers reported that had not yet received ET&L training. We excluded respondents who indicated they had not received training from this section of the survey by using a skip pattern in the survey. As such, this section examines items that were asked only of respondents who reported that they received training. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Out of 181 respondents, 176 participated in more than one type of training. As such, it was not possible to disaggregate responses to survey items about training experiences by training type. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Accounts were created for all educators in active districts, but districts were responsible for supplying log-in data to users for access, so it is possible that a large number of the account holders did not have access to the system. This figure is nonetheless an indication of low overall system usage. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Note that available usage data were limited to assessment creation, assessment administration, and creation of instructional materials. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The reporting feature can be accessed through the Reporting tab in ET&L but is also linked to the Assessment tool. Reporting tool use was not included in the system usage data. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. In Table 11, no logins are reported for July 2014. This discrepancy is due to a timing difference in the way the ET&L vendor record counts for logins and counts for other activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. For details about Edwin Analytics usage data analyses, see *Evaluation of the Pilot and Implementation of Edwin: Technical Data* (2014). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Previous rank is based on *Technical Data Collection Report 4* (October 2014), consisting of data from June 2, 2014, through June 8, 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Districts with high proportions of these subpopulations generated more total reports on average than districts with lower proportions. However, district size was highly correlated with proportion of these subpopulations, and district size also was highly correlated with the number of reports generated. Therefore, total number of reports generated could not serve as a useful metric. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. We have attempted to draw a distinction between the issues listed here, which we believe originate from the ET&L system itself, and technology issues whose origin is most likely in equipment controlled by the schools and districts (technology issues are discussed in the next section). However, in some cases, the origin of the problem is unclear and could be either (e.g., in the case of data transmission through SIF). In general, probing evaluation participants did not result in the information we need to make this distinction, so we have made an educated guess. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Some of these challenges could be the result of user error; nonetheless, they represent challenges that users faced with the system. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Schools that had committed to using ET&L and uploaded their data were not present in the usage analysis if the data were loaded so recently that they would not have had the chance to login; the count of these schools was not provided. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. We are tracking RTTT district adoption specifically, because the RTTT grant was the primary funding source for the initial implementation of ET&L. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Beginning in December 2014, Thinkgate began rolling out a series of short video tutorials to train users on specific tasks, called Thinkgate TV. This is a potentially valuable resource, but its implementation fell outside the time frame of the current evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. If the teacher indicates that he or she does not have access to Edwin Analytics, do this portion for 45–50 minutes, spending more time on each scenario. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Do this section only if the teacher has access to Edwin Analytics. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)