

Victory Self-Worth and Value Program Instructional Design Review

Alan J. Reid, PhD
Steven M. Ross, PhD

April 2022



JOHNS HOPKINS
SCHOOL *of* EDUCATION

Center for Research and
Reform in Education

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Design Review	2
Program Design Framework and Process	2
Program Content Selection and Design	3
Program Evaluation	6
Materials/Interface Design	6
Summary and Recommendations.....	8
Program Design and Framework	8
Program Content Selection and Design	8
Program Evaluation	9
Materials/Interface Design	9
Appendix A: Statement of Work	10
Appendix B: Design Review Rubric.....	13

Introduction

This design review for the Victory Self-Worth and Value Program included an evaluation of various materials and information provided by the program developer. The digital materials submitted for review included the Victory Assessment, Rubric, Program Learning Outcomes, Program Facilitators Manual, Student Handbook, Assessment Data Tracker, Interventions Sheets, and a marketing brochure. The developer of the Victory Program also provided responses to interviews that were conducted via email and video conference. The Statement of Work is provided in Appendix A.

According to programmatic materials, the Victory Self-Worth and Value Program seeks to provide individuals with experiences that allows for the restructuring of cognitive and emotion distortion, thus providing the opportunity to change attitudes and behaviors around three key areas: self-esteem, relationship building, and personal development. The Victory program relies upon an experiential model to simulate positive interactions within a supportive group environment. The 15-session program integrates aspects of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and restorative practice strategies into educational instruction across training platforms, with a consideration of culturally responsive practices.

The following design review follows the standard Design Review Rubric (Appendix B) used in the CRRE for all programmatic reviews. When appropriate, specific references are made to the materials submitted by the developer and to the responses obtained during phone and video interviews.

Materials

Digital programmatic materials and evaluation data were shared with the reviewer via a secure folder. Specifically, these items included:

- The Victory Assessment
- The Victory Rubric
- The Victory Programs Learning Outcomes
- The Victory Program Facilitator's Manual
- The Victory Student Handbook
- The Victory Assessment Data Tracker
- The Victory Interventions Sheets

Design Review

The following section describes each criterion from the Design Review Rubric in detail, providing a justification for its rating. Table 1 shows a collapsed view of the scores for each criterion; a full explanation of the review criteria can be found in Appendix B.

Table 1. A collapsed view of the Design Review Rubric results.

	Limited	Moderate	Strong
Program Design Framework and Process			
1. Specific ToA or Logic Model	✓		
2. Systematic design process		✓	
Program Content Selection and Design			
1. Specific instructional or curriculum needs			✓
2. Comprehensive design plan		✓	
3. Addresses individual learner needs			✓
4. Instructional objectives		✓	
5. Instructional sequencing			✓
Program Evaluation			
1. Formative evaluation			✓
2. Summative evaluation			✓
Materials Interface / Design			
1. Costs and resources are specified	✓		
2. Support for users			✓
3. Student feedback			✓
4. Teacher assessment data			✓

Program Design Framework and Process

1. The program design clearly specifies a systemic Theory of Action (or Logic Model).

The Victory Self-Worth Program utilizes aspects of Cognitive Learning Theory and Social Learning Theory, which are evident in its design. While these theories guide the content, program documentation did not include a systemic Theory of Action (ToA) or logic model. This likely is implied within the program design, but a more visible logic model is recommended to increase transparency and specify outcomes for success. The

logic model should articulate a clear problem statement, the inputs (activities and strategies) and outputs (short- intermediate- and long-term outcomes).¹

Consideration should be given to the creation and adherence to a unique, grounded logic model that clearly explains the processes and desired outcomes of the Victory Self-Worth Program. We recommend strengthening the program with its own logic model that clearly specifies the intended inputs and outputs.

Rating: Limited

2. A systematic design process was used to develop, evaluate, and refine materials.

Documentation suggests that the Victory Self-Worth Program underwent an informal development process that yielded a subsequent refinement of programmatic materials, based on an earlier version of the program titled, "Driven". According to the developer, "I critiqued the program and listen to the suggestions of the participants as well as advisors in the community that were close to the work. I continually assessed for development, implementation, and assessment strategies for success." This ongoing design process continues in the form of formative evaluation efforts (such as this design review) and planned summative evaluation measures.

An informal process was used to design and revise the program materials. However, more formal documentation and accounting of the design process is recommended.

Rating: Moderate

Program Content Selection and Design

1. The program design addresses specified instructional/ curriculum needs.

The Victory Self-Worth Program was designed with specific instructional needs in mind. In particular, the program aims "to teach people that their lives have purpose, meaning, and value." This worthwhile endeavor applies to a variety of learner populations including students and prison inmates who might have a deficiency in these areas.

While the Victory Self-Worth Program does not address specific curricular needs, it does provide critical socio-emotional learning skills geared towards a specific learner

¹ Here is an example of a clear Logic Model employed by the Nebraska Department of Education: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/central/blog/theory-of-action-nebraska.asp>

population. The program could be improved by aligning its content with explicit standards, such as Common Core State Standards, for widespread use within schools.

Rating: *Strong*

2. A comprehensive design plan was employed in developing the program.

A comprehensive design plan was not utilized in the development of the Victory Self-Worth Program. As stated by the program developer, the current iteration of the program evolved out of an earlier draft (Driven), based on the results of multiple informal formative evaluations.

Although the Victory Self-Worth Program has been finetuned over several years, it could be improved by articulating a comprehensive design plan for formative and summative evaluation plans moving forward.

Rating: *Moderate*

3. The program design addresses individual learner needs for high achievement.

The Victory Self-Worth Program is an intervention and remediation program meant for individual personal development. Therefore, the program is highly personalized and structured to meet the needs of all learners. The program is recommended for 1:1 interaction and for small group settings, where appropriate learner differentiation is most likely to occur.

Rating: *Strong*

4. Instructional objectives are systematically developed and clearly specified.

The Victory Self-Worth Program has a general purpose, as explained by the program developer: "The objective now is for individuals to develop healthy self-esteem, by implementing restorative practices that support social emotional learning that builds healthy relationships and fostering positive personal development." More locally, each session begins by identifying "Program Objectives", which state the intended outcomes for that session but are somewhat generic and vaguely defined.

From an instructional design perspective, instructional objectives should be derived from a needs assessment or analysis and a task analysis. After stating the objectives, the designer can ensure that the objectives are aligned with goals or needs of the

learner. A robust objective provides the information needed to design the instruction, instructional strategy, and evaluation.

Instructional objectives can be written in either a traditional Mager format or cognitive format.² The difference between the two is that Mager (behavioral) objectives are more explicit in their description of observable behavior and the degree to which it should be performed. As designers, we often refer to the ABCD (Audience, Behavior, Condition, and Degree) framework for writing behavioral objectives. Conversely, cognitive objectives indicate broader performance in which the evaluator can discern whether the learner has demonstrated this behavior. In both cases, constructing instructional objectives helps to specify learner performance and provide a means of assessing the learner's performance, which can then inform appropriate instruction.

The Victory Self-Worth Program lends itself more to cognitive objectives, particularly because the program is built upon a foundation of Cognitive Learning Theory. Although these are broader than behavioral objectives, they still should include a measurable performance that can be assessed clearly.

Rating: Moderate

5. Instructional sequencing is aligned with objectives and adaptive to learner needs.

The Victory Self-Worth Program follows a clear sequence for instruction. According to the program developer, "The program has three modules with 9 key indicators which are identified in the assessment cycle, this allows me to develop intervention strategies and actions steps to implement with each participant post program participation."

Personalization is a clear strength of the program. Because of the organization of each module and unit, the student and teacher develop a routine and know what to expect from each lesson and from each other. Students do not progress in the program until each skill is met.

No recommendations are proposed for sequencing other than ensuring that the instructional sequence is aligned with the instructional objectives once they are developed.

Rating: Strong

² Gronlund, N. E. (2008). *Writing instructional objectives* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Program Evaluation

1. Formative evaluation was used to develop and refine the program.

According to programmatic materials, a 45-item questionnaire (Victory Assessment) is used to formatively evaluate the program. However, the tool is designed to measure program effectiveness rather than to collect formative evaluation data. A more structured formative evaluation is highly encouraged. This evaluation could take the form of attitudinal surveys or small focus groups with the intent to gather data on the strengths/weaknesses of the program and recommendations for improvement.

In response to the interview questions, the developer stated that he “provided a programmatic and instructor evaluation, the programmatic evaluation was a post, from those finding I created an evaluation report. The evaluation report allowed me to adjust the program based on findings from class materials, speakers, and participant engagement.” This is more aligned with conducting a formative evaluation to refine the program. Altogether, the findings yielded important recommendations that were acted upon by program developer.

Rating: Strong

2. Summative evaluation was used to obtain evidence on program effectiveness.

The documentation does not provide evidence of a plan for formal or informal use of summative evaluation. However, the program developer is considering a full rigorous third-party quasi- or randomized-experimental study in the near future; for this reason, a rating of *Strong* is assigned. Notably, the Victory Assessment is a 45-item questionnaire that is administered during the first and final weeks of the program to gauge participant perceptions and attitudes in the areas of self-esteem, relationship-building, and personal development. The pre/post assessment design provides insight into learner growth as a result of participating in the program. As such, this is a highly valuable tool for analyzing program effectiveness. Still, we encourage the developer to devise and follow through with a summative evaluation plan to document the effectiveness of the program and identify areas for improvement, as indicated by the program participants.

Rating: Strong

Materials/Interface Design

1. Costs and resources needed for using the program are clearly specified.

The program utilizes a well-designed brochure for its marketing materials. The brochure does not contain information specific to the Victory Self-Worth and Value Program, though it does provide related information for the umbrella organization, I-nspire, including mission and vision statements, program outcomes, programs offered, and contact information. Costs and resources are not explicitly stated on the marketing materials, but this is an easy adjustment to make.

Rating: Limited

2. Support for users is timely and effective.

User support is readily available and provided through direct contact with the program facilitator in real-time. Effectively, the program is not implemented without the facilitator. The benefit of this support mechanism is the high degree of personalized support for users in individual or small group settings. The drawback is that support is entirely dependent upon the availability and responsiveness of the facilitator. As the program continues to scale up, a more robust support mechanism should be considered, such as online forums for sharing experiences, asking questions, and making suggestions for improvement.

The program developer might also consider utilizing peer-to-peer support from program leaders. This can be accomplished by building an online repository of knowledge articles, FAQ's, best practices, and tips and tricks that program leaders have found useful and effective. This could easily be scaffolded onto the program materials. In addition, program leaders should be given a forum to connect and discuss their experiences; this would be an indirect form of support and development that could enhance the program.

Rating: Strong

3. Students receive clear and relevant feedback about their performance.

The amount and extent of feedback that students receive is dependent upon the individual teacher, although the Facilitator's Manual does provide some opportunities for assessing learner performance throughout the instruction. Because of the learner-centered nature of the program, feedback is customized and communicated often, though this hinges on the facilitator.

Rating: Strong

4. Teachers receive assessment data for tracking students' progress.

The 45-item Victory Assessment questionnaire provides facilitators with valuable data on learner progress. Additionally, facilitators are acutely aware of learner progress due

to the conversational nature of the program, which asks learners to demonstrate their understanding orally by responding to prompts. This works in-the-moment, but the assessment data could be utilized much more effectively here. A facilitator could be given a space to write comments or to answer brief questions (such as a checklist) to denote learner understanding. This data could be accumulated and viewable by facilitators on a dashboard or gradebook-type setup, where student progress over time becomes more visible.

Also, capturing this assessment data could benefit the program developer by providing an appraisal of the instructional content that learners struggle with the most. Learners do receive feedback on their responses, but this feedback should be tracked and monitored.

Rating: *Strong*

Summary and Recommendations

Our overall impression is that the Victory Self-Worth Program has significant value to its learners. It is evident that usability, navigability, and consistency within the design was prioritized in the development of the instructional materials. The following recommendations are suggested as means to improve the quality of this program even further.

Program Design and Framework

A rating of *Limited* was assigned to the criterion for specifying a clear, systemic Theory of Action (or logic model), which was not present prior to the development of the program. It is strongly encouraged that a logic model be created to articulate how, specifically, the program's theoretical frameworks blend with the inputs, outputs, and resources that are associated with the program goals and objectives.

More favorably, a rating of *Moderate* was given to the iterative design process that was used to design, develop, and evaluate the program materials. The trial and error-style revision process served as an informal formative evaluation, and changes were made in direct response to user experiences and feedback. Although it could be planned and documented more clearly, the design process has worked well thus far.

Program Content Selection and Design

Most aspects of this category were evaluated as *Strong*, with the exception of two areas – comprehensive design plan and instructional objectives – which both received a slightly lower rating of *Moderate*. The design of the instruction begin each session with

clearly stated objectives that are made visible to the facilitator and the learner, though these cognitive objectives could be defined more explicitly and in a more measurable way. For future revisions and development, we would encourage the developer to specify these cognitive objectives, conduct a task analysis of the content needed to support the objectives, and then design specific instructional strategies to help achieve each objective in the module and to be accurately assessed. Many instructional design texts provide selected instructional strategies for different types of objectives (cf. Morrison, Ross, Morrison, & Kalman (2019) *Designing effective instruction, 8th Ed.*, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.). There is room for improvement with many of the instructional objectives, which are at times, generic and hard to evaluate. The objectives should be clearly stated to communicate the expected performance and criteria for proficiency or mastery. For reference, see the Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Objectives.

The program's specific curriculum, instructional sequencing, and attention paid to individual learner needs, all received a rating of *Strong* and are included in the current program design, though it is recommended that the content be tied more closely to formal curriculum for a broader inclusion in schools.

Program Evaluation

Although ratings of *Strong* were assigned to these criteria, we strongly recommend the continued use of a more formal formative evaluation and follow-through with a planned summative evaluation to ensure the quality and accuracy of the materials.

Materials/Interface Design

The explication of the cost and resources for the program was not clear or easily accessible. For this reason, this criterion was given a rating of *Limited*.

Conversely, the remainder of this category received a rating of *Strong*. The learner-centered design of the program provides personalized support for users, learner feedback, and assessment data for facilitators. It is recommended, though, that the program developers expand the program into a digital space, which would allow for more dynamic interactivity and data management. It is recommended that the program institute online communities for the purposes of sharing content, asking questions, reviewing resources, and to connect with other learners and facilitators. A Community of Inquiry (CoI) model might fit best with the Victory Self-Worth Program.

Appendix A: Statement of Work

Statement of Work Victory Self-Worth and Value Program Instructional Design Review

Johns Hopkins University
Center for Research and Reform in Education

January 2022

The Victory Self-Worth and Value Program, designed as intervention for male adults striving to improve their lives, is currently being considered for broader use by the Shelby County (TN) Division of Corrections (SCSD). The goal of this project is to provide the program developer with formative evaluation feedback on the quality and validity of the program materials. Specifically, an experienced design-based researcher from CRRE will:

- Meet virtually with the developer (client) to clearly define the goals of the intervention and obtain an overview of each tool to be examined (see listing below).
- Obtain a copy (virtual or actual) of each tool.
- Review each tool individually and collectively for face validity and conformity with quality design principles.
- Create a “formative” design-based evaluation report for the major purpose of informing the developer of program strengths and improvement needs.

It is important to indicate our awareness that the client’s ultimate goal of engaging CRRE is to obtain a positive third-party evaluation report to include in an application to SCSD. Mature programs that have undergone systemic formative evaluation and development may receive such a positive evaluation report, sufficient for some type of accreditation, in an initial review of the type proposed here. However, for developing programs, a three-step process is more common, the first being the initial formative evaluation, the second being program improvement based on the recommendations, and the third being a subsequent review (expectedly positive if needed improvements were made).

For the present project, the materials targeted for review specifically include:

- The Victory Assessment
- The Victory Rubric
- The Victory Programs Learning Outcomes
- The Victory Program Facilitators Manual
- The Victory Student Handbook
- The Victory Assessment Data Tracker
- The Victory Interventions Sheets

Proposed Services and Deliverables

To respond to the client's interests and needs, The Johns Hopkins Center for Research and Reform in Education (CRRE) proposes engaging in the following activities:

- **Program Design Review:** Evaluate program design relative to various categories of design using a battery of rubric quality levels (e.g., Instructional Objectives, Instructional Theory (Logic Model), Learner Analysis, Task Analysis, Content Sequencing, Instructional Strategies, Assessment and Feedback Systems).
- **State Standards Alignment Review:** Evaluate alignment of curriculum to Arizona state standards.
- **Deliverable:** Drawing from the above activities, CRRE will produce a report describing the results of reviews and offer recommendations for refinement of the program and how it is used, as appropriate.

Input for the reviews will consist of access to curriculum materials and completion by school administrators of a *Program Design Review* template with all requested information about the program design, rationale, and design components.

Timeline

Proposed timelines for the instructional design review are as follows:

<i>February 2022</i>	Complete contract and initiate services
<i>April 1, 2022</i>	Provide services in accord with SOW (report by April 1)

Budget

\$3,000 + \$510 (17% JHU Indirect Costs) = \$3,510

CRRE will carefully monitor costs over the duration of the project to remain within the present SOW budget. If services beyond the existing budget are requested, supplementary funds will be required in an addendum to the contract.

CRRE Organizational Capacity

Principal Investigator: Dr. Steven Ross
Project Leader: Dr. Alan Reid

Johns Hopkins University is one of the nation's premier research institutions. The Center for Research and Reform in Education (CRRE) at Johns Hopkins will provide strong and consistent organizational support as follows:

(1) Organizational support and commitment. Johns Hopkins University provides multiple levels of support to CRRE. The Dean of the School of Education reviews and approves key personnel

and policy decisions, but imposes no formal or informal obligations to other departments or units. The Dean appoints Center researchers upon the recommendation of the Director. CRRE has six Ph.D.'s and eight other research and support staff engaged in a wide range of research involving children from preschool through high school who are in high-poverty communities. CRRE principal investigators are full-time researchers without teaching responsibilities who are therefore able to focus on high-quality longitudinal research, including many randomized and matched field experiments.

(2) Program assistance. University offices assist in the effective and efficient operation of the Center. The University's Homewood Research Administration administers grants and contracts, the Controller's Office provides accurate and timely monthly statements for budgetary control, Human Resources assists in hiring and salary administration, Library Services provides a full range of assistance in research and document procurement, and the Office of Communications and Public Affairs assists in national dissemination of research work.

(3) Resources. CRRE's main office is located off campus. All research will therefore qualify for low off-campus overhead rates. The Hopkins facility provides front office administrative and clerical services, photocopying and conference rooms, and areas for maintaining data and inventories of CRRE publications.

Appendix B: Design Review Rubric

Program Design Framework and Process				
	Limited	Moderate	Strong	Source
1. The program design clearly specifies a systemic Theory of Action (or Logic Model).	<p>*The Theory of Action (ToA) is not adequately represented in standard project or submitted support material.</p> <p>OR,</p> <p>*The represented ToA is not logically or sufficiently specified for achieving defined product goals.</p> <p>OR,</p> <p>*The represented ToA is not appropriate for this instruction.</p>	<p>*The Theory of Action (ToA) is described in the design rationale and materials provided for review (but may not be disseminated to prospective users).</p> <p>*The ToA logically connects inputs to outputs with at least moderate detail.</p> <p>*Outcomes are consistent with defined product goals (student achievement and/or other).</p>	<p>*The Theory of Action (ToA) is explicitly described in the design rationale and materials disseminated routinely to prospective users.</p> <p>*The ToA is logical, detailed, and comprehensive.</p> <p>*The ToA clearly shows how "inputs" lead to mediating and culminating outputs, consistent with defined product goals (student achievement and/or other).</p>	Design rationale Program materials

<p>2. A systematic (iterative) design process was used to develop, evaluate, and refine materials in accord with the Logic Model.</p>	<p>* Standard program documentation or submitted support material do NOT demonstrate informal or formal use of an iterative design process of tryouts, evaluation, refinement, etc.</p>	<p>*Standard program documentation or submitted support material demonstrate informal or formal use of MOST of the following design processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Initial design -Formative evaluation plan -Trial and revision -Implementation and monitoring -Evaluation of each element and program whole -Revision/redesign as appropriate 	<p>*Standard program documentation or submitted support material demonstrate systematic use of ALL of the following design processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Initial design -Formative evaluation plan -Trial and revision -Implementation and monitoring -Evaluation of each element and program whole -Revision/redesign as appropriate 	<p>Program documentation or support materials</p> <p>Interview with designers or evaluators</p>
---	---	---	--	---

Program Content Selection and Design				
	Limited	Moderate	Strong	Source
<p>1. The program design addresses specified instructional/ curriculum needs.</p>	<p>*Alignment of the program design with instructional/ curriculum needs is only generally described and not adequately supported.</p>	<p>*The program design appears to support instructional/ curriculum needs via broad alignment with defined standards (e.g., Common Core State Standards or other).</p> <p>*The content alignment or selection process is described in materials provided for review but only generally in standard program documentation.</p>	<p>*The program design is directly and explicitly connected to instructional/ curriculum needs via systematic alignment with defined standards (e.g., Common Core State Standards or other).</p> <p>*The content alignment or selection process is described in standard program documentation.</p> <p>*Objectives developed for local implementation that align with defined standards</p> <p>*Formal expert review of content was performed</p>	<p>Program documentation</p> <p>Program review</p>

<p>2. A comprehensive design plan was employed in developing the program.</p>	<p>*Program design did not use a systematic process of analyzing instructional needs, content sequencing, and instructional method in accord with learning objectives and target user needs.</p>	<p>*Program design included systematic use of <i>most</i> of following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Instructional needs analysis for target users. -Specification of instructional objectives. -Content sequencing in accord with objectives and instructional/ curriculum needs. -Instructional strategies and methods in accord with learner and instructional/ curriculum needs. 	<p>*Program design included systematic use of ALL of the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Instructional needs analysis for target users. -Specification of instructional objectives. -Content sequencing in accord with objectives and instructional/ curriculum needs. -Instructional strategies and methods in accord with learner and instructional/ curriculum needs. 	<p>Program documentation</p>
<p>3. The program design addresses individual learner needs for high achievement.</p>	<p>*The program design description and operation do not demonstrate sufficient support for accommodating student readiness, expected prior learning, or individual needs for adaptive instruction.</p>	<p>*The content and learning activities appear to have been designed so as to be developmentally appropriate for targeted grade-levels.</p> <p>*Prerequisite learning needs are identified fully or in part in program documentation.</p> <p>*Instruction/lesson activities feature some capabilities for adaptation to student needs, such as self-pacing, variation of content difficulty.</p>	<p>*The content and learning activities are explicitly designed to be developmentally appropriate for targeted grade-levels.</p> <p>*Prerequisite learning needs are analyzed, documented for users, and accounted for in the lesson design.</p> <p>*Instruction/Lesson activities support the mastery knowledge/skills specified in objectives.</p> <p>*Instruction/lesson activities are highly adapted to individual learner needs (e.g., achievement levels).</p> <p>*Appropriate lesson completion time (or individual pacing options) is provided.</p>	<p>Program documentation Program review</p>

<p>4. Instructional objectives are systematically developed and clearly specified.</p>	<p>*Program learning (or other objectives) may be implicit or informally defined but</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -are not made explicit to users <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -do not clearly address outcomes, learning domains, expectations, etc. 	<p>*Program learning (and/or other) objectives are specified.</p> <p>* <i>Some</i> of the following are included (as relevant):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Purposes of the program are clear to the teacher, learner, or target user. -Learner (or other) performance expectations (what knowledge and/or skills) are specified. -How learning (or other) mastery is assessed. -Target domains of learning (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, or other) 	<p>*A systematic process was used to develop objectives (learner/teacher/ curriculum needs)</p> <p>* <i>All or most</i> of the following are included (as relevant):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Purposes of the program are clear to the teacher, learner, or target user. -Objectives are revised or modified for local implementation rather than adopted as is. -Learner (or other) performance expectations (what knowledge and/or skills) are specified. -How learning (or other) mastery is assessed. -Target domains of learning (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, or other) 	<p>Program documentation Program review</p>
--	---	--	--	---

<p>5. Instructional sequencing is aligned with objectives and adaptive to learner needs.</p>	<p>*Instructional sequencing may be implicit or informally defined, but:</p> <p>-is not supported in terms of logic or rationale</p> <p>AND</p> <p>-only weakly, if at all, addresses instructional objectives, learner needs, or developing comprehension and mastery in a systematic way.</p>	<p>*A rationale or logic for instructional sequencing is provided in program materials.</p> <p>* <i>Some</i> of the following attributes of sequencing are included (as relevant):</p> <p>-Aligned with instructional objectives. -Informed or corroborated by content experts. -Is flexible based on learner performance and needs. -Is logical in developing learner comprehension and mastery (addresses prerequisites, builds on prior knowledge and content, etc.)</p>	<p>*A systematic process was used to develop instructional sequencing.</p> <p>* <i>All or most</i> of the following attributes of sequencing are included (as relevant):</p> <p>-Aligned with instructional objectives. -Informed or corroborated by content experts. -Is flexible based on learner performance and needs. -Is logical in developing learner comprehension and mastery (addresses prerequisites, builds on prior knowledge and content, etc.)</p>	<p>Program documentation Program review</p>
--	---	--	--	--

Program Evaluation				
	Limited	Moderate	Strong	Source
1. Formative evaluation was used to develop and refine the program.	<p>*Standard program documentation or submitted support material do NOT demonstrate informal or sufficient formal use of formative evaluation to develop and refine the program.</p>	<p>*Standard program documentation or submitted support material demonstrate informal or formal use of <i>SOME</i> of the following formative evaluation processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Beta testing of program operation. -Individual user tryouts. -Small-group tryouts. -Piloting in realistic settings. <p>*Formative evaluation data are used <i>intermittently</i> by the design team for program refinement.</p>	<p>*Standard program documentation or submitted support material demonstrate systematic use of <i>MOST</i> or <i>ALL</i> of the following formative evaluation processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Beta testing of program operation. -Individual user tryouts. -Small-group tryouts. -Piloting in realistic settings. <p>*Formative evaluation data are used <i>continuously</i> by the design team for program refinement.</p> <p>*Documentation provided that show method, data, and recommended revisions for one or more formative evaluation efforts.</p>	Program documentation

<p>2. Summative evaluation was used to obtain evidence on program effectiveness.</p>	<p>*Standard program documentation or submitted support material do NOT demonstrate sufficient informal or formal use of summative evaluation to develop and refine the program.</p>	<p>*Standard program documentation or submitted support material demonstrate the following summative evaluation processes:</p> <p>*Evaluation evidence is available from:</p> <p>-At least one rigorous third-party case study or well-designed third-party experimental study</p> <p>*Summative evaluation data are used <i>intermittently</i> by the design team for program refinement.</p> <p>*Additional studies are in process or planned.</p>	<p>*Standard program documentation or submitted support material demonstrate the following summative evaluation processes:</p> <p>*Evaluation evidence is available from:</p> <p>-At least two rigorous third-party case studies.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>-At least one rigorous third-party quasi- or randomized-experimental study</p> <p>*Summative evaluation data are used <i>continually</i> by the design team for program refinement.</p> <p>*Additional studies are in process or planned.</p>	<p>Program documentation</p>
--	--	--	--	------------------------------

Materials/Interface Design				
	Limited	Moderate	Strong	Source
1. Costs and resources needed for using the program are clearly specified.	<p>*Cost and resources beyond original purchasing are not communicated clearly in advance.</p> <p>*Unspecified supplemental costs may occur in some of the areas identified for <i>Strong</i> status.</p>	<p>*Costs and resources beyond original purchasing are generally communicated for consumers in the areas identified for <i>Strong</i> status.</p> <p>*There are no hidden costs of any substance.</p>	<p>*Costs and resources beyond original purchasing are clearly specified and described in relation to implementation quality with regard to the follow areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Additional equipment/ Materials -Technical or other support -Staff costs (paraprofessionals, technology coach, etc.) -Space/facilities (computer lab; classrooms) -Access to data from provider <p>*There are no hidden costs of any substance.</p>	Marketing materials

<p>2. Support for users is timely and effective.</p>	<p>*Support for users is not explicitly or formally offered in the product or from the provider.</p>	<p>*Program use appears logical and intuitive.</p> <p>*Help for technical difficulties is built into the program and/or can be obtained by contacting the provider.</p>	<p>*Program use appears highly logical and intuitive.</p> <p>*An online or print program "user's guide" describes solutions for common technical problems.</p> <p>*Timely and effective help for technical difficulties is built into the program and/or readily and explicitly available from the provider ("help line" or other contact outlet).</p>	<p>Program User guide</p>
<p>3. Students receive clear and relevant feedback about their performance.</p>	<p>*Feedback to students is not provided in a manner consistent with the Logic Model.</p>	<p>*The rationale for providing feedback seems consistent with the Logic Model but may not be formally described.</p> <p>*Some performance feedback is intermittently provided to students.</p>	<p>*The provision of feedback is logically determined and described on the basis of the program's Logic Model</p> <p>*Performance feedback is provided to students at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>Program</p>

<p>4. Teachers receive assessment data for tracking students' progress.</p>	<p>*Assessment data are not provided or presented without adequate clarity or teacher support.</p>	<p>*Assessment data are provided to teachers as part of the program, but without explicit or strong connection to the Logic Model.</p> <p>*Some explanation of how to use and interpret the data is provided in program documentation.</p>	<p>*The provision of assessment data is logically determined and described on the basis of the Logic Model.</p> <p>*Assessment data are provided to teachers continuously by the program or provider.</p> <p>*Assessment data are provided in a clear and interpretable form.</p> <p>*Explanations of how to interpret the data are provided in program documentation.</p>	<p>Program Program documentation (teacher guide)</p>
---	--	--	--	--