

ePEARL Implementation Assessment Protocol v2 - 2009

The IAP will be used to determine which research classes have had enough exposure to ePEARL and related SRL processes to justify attributing change to exposure to ePEARL. This protocol was created by consulting action research literature on e-Portfolios, data from our pilot study (2006-2007), and the use of IAP v1 for the 2007-2008 research data. This table will allow a systematic and structured review of teacher and student use of ePEARL to ensure good quality data for analysis. Classrooms that are coded as “low” implementers may not be included in the final analysis.

	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
IFQ – hrs/month	Hrs. ≤4	5-12	13≤ hrs.
Avg. # artifacts	Artifacts ≤3	4-6	7≤ artifacts
Date range of use	Entries span less than 60 days	Entries span 61-120 days	Entries span 121 days or more
Uses of ePEARL			
Planning: Goals & Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 or no General Goals • 1 or no Task Goals • 1 or no Strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 2 General Goals • At least 3 artifacts have goals/strategies • Goals & strategies may be vague, inappropriate, or may be attached to a grade/mark 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 or more General Goals – some may have been revised • 4 or more artifacts have goals & strategies • Goals & strategies are clearly defined and appropriate to the task
Doing: Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storage only • Incomplete entries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artifacts may be in only one subject area • At least 3 artifacts have content • Content is missing in some artifacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creative use of ePEARL (different attachments, well developed home page) • 4 or more artifacts have content included (attachments, text editor, audio files) • Artifacts included from multiple subject areas • Multiple versions of artifacts
Reflecting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 or no reflections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 3 artifacts have reflections • Reflections are brief and generally vague (“I liked it, I had fun”) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 or more artifacts have reflections • Reflections show deep thought about learning process and/or addresses goals & strategies
Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher feedback in less than 3 artifacts • Feedback is evaluative only (gives a score) • Feedback from peers has a lot of “chat” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher feedback on 4 or more artifacts • Feedback offers suggestions, asks questions, stimulates reflection • Feedback from peers includes constructive suggestions
Presentations Folder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-2 items • no reflection/selection reasons given or icons only selected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at least 3 items with reflection/selection explanation included

8/8/24

Procedure:

- 1) IFQ data (IFQ1 & IFQ2) will be entered into excel spreadsheet: “Implementation Assessment Protocol” to calculate average # of hours /month teachers report using ePEARL
- 2) Date of entries will be entered into excel spreadsheet to calculate the date range of use. These ranges will be calculated in days.
- 3) A random sample of 5 student portfolios will be analyzed at the end of the school year
 - a. The excel random number generator will be used to select 5 numbers between 1-30 (based on number of students in each class)
 - b. Members of the research team will each be assigned 5 portfolios in each of the experimental classes to analyze. Each class will be assessed by two members of the research team independently.
 - c. A printout of each selected portfolio’s artifacts index page (from both the portfolio and presentations folder) will be made to have a hard copy that shows the # of artifacts and if there are attachments, goals, reflections and feedback
 - d. The average number of entries for these 5 students will be calculated and entered into the worksheet.
 - e. If **at least 3 artifacts** have goals, reflections and feedback these artifacts will be analyzed to view the content and quality of the entries (medium or high)
 - f. Multiple versions of a single artifact only count as ONE entry
 - g. In order to align our findings with last year’s protocol, each researcher will apply IAP v1 to the class first, then reevaluate using IAP v2 to get deeper data re: use of SRL processes and the presentations folder.
- 4) The research team will meet to discuss their findings and discuss classrooms that do not clearly meet the criteria for “low” implementation. All final codes and decisions will be reviewed by the entire ePEARL team.

References:

- Abrami, P. & Pillay, V. (2007) *Implementation Fidelity Questionnaire*. Concordia University, CSLP: Montreal, QC.
- Abrami, P. & Barrett, H. (2005) Directions for Research and Development on Electronic Portfolios. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology* 31 (3).
- Abrami, P., Wade, A., Pillay, V., Aslan, O., Bures, E., and Bentley, C. (2007) *Encouraging Self-Regulated Learning Through Electronic Portfolios*. Paper presented at the Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE), E-Learn 2007: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, & Higher Education. Chesapeake, VA: AACE.
- Barrett, H. (2007) Researching electronic portfolios and learner engagement: The REFLECT initiative. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 50(6) 436-449.
- Bures, E. & Bentley, C. (2007) *Research Measure to Evaluate E-Portfolios: Codebook*. Concordia University, CSLP: Montreal, QC.