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Executive Summary

Capturing the potential of technology is one of five critical challenge areas to be addressed in the Washington Student Achievement Council’s Ten-Year Roadmap. Council members reviewed the Technology Issue Briefing on May 23, 2013. This report provides the Council with policy options to consider and prioritize for inclusion in the Ten-Year Roadmap. The Council will consider this policy options report at its July meeting.

This report reflects a diversity of input, providing the Council with policy options that encourage and support the use of technology to advance teaching and learning in the classroom. The Workgroup identified the following three broad policy options for the Council’s consideration.

- Develop a statewide P20 educational technology consortium.
- Provide incentives to support adoption and innovation.
- Scale up successful innovations to create national assessment models.

When considering the policy options described in this report, the Council should keep in mind that the fundamental responsibility for educators is to focus on student learning and students’ educational experiences. Though we need to be nimble in the use of technology, we must also insure that the learning objectives determine the selection and use of technology. Without clear strategies for optimizing the use of technology to educate students within the context of existing and grounded pedagogy, technology’s value as a tool for increasing educational attainment will be diminished.
Context of the Ten-Year Roadmap

Increasing educational attainment is vital to the well-being of Washington residents and to the health of our state’s economy. To this end, the Washington Student Achievement Council is working to propose goals and strategies for increasing educational attainment through a Ten-Year Roadmap and a two-year Strategic Action Plan.¹

The Council’s Strategic Action Plan, adopted in November 2012, identifies five critical challenges to be addressed in the Roadmap. The five challenge areas are:

1. **Student Readiness** (with four planning activities: Early Learning; Outreach and Support; Alignment; Remedial Postsecondary Education)
2. **Affordability**
3. **Institutional Capacity and Student Success** (with two planning activities: Meeting Increased Demand; Assessment of Student Skills and Knowledge)
4. **Capturing the Potential of Technology**
5. **Stable and Accountable Funding**

To inform the Council’s creation of the first Roadmap, workgroups comprising lead Washington Student Achievement Council Members, Council staff, and external workgroup members were formed to research, discuss, and develop issue briefings and policy recommendations for each of these five critical challenge areas.

The Challenge Areas are complex and interrelated. While the Roadmap will recommend actions for each of the Challenge Areas, these recommendations will be integrated into a cohesive plan.

**Challenge Area: Capturing the Potential of Technology**

This is the second report to the Council on the topic of technology. The first report² provided an overview of the issue; this second report highlights an array of policy options. This report also contains an appendix with an overview of lessons learned from workplace-based e-learning projects presented during a recent meeting of the Association of Washington Business Institute. Both reports serve as resources to Council members in the development of the Ten-Year Roadmap.
Introduction

The primary policy issue addressed by the workgroup was whether Washington could and should more effectively leverage technology to improve teaching and learning at Washington colleges and universities—in ways that reduce the cost of attendance for students and expand system capacity in a cost-effective manner while maintaining quality. The Workgroup determined early on that when technology is used properly, the overall quality of the educational experience—whether in the classroom or at a distance—can be improved if the focus remains on education first and technology second. The Technology Issue Briefing submitted to the Council in May described instructional best practices, supporting activities necessary to implement instructional best practices, an overview of trends and challenges, and criteria for evaluating the use of technology for teaching and learning.

This report offers potential policy options for the Council’s consideration in developing the Ten-Year Roadmap.

Policy Options

Three broad policy options and four underlying principles emerged from the Issue Briefing and workgroup input. The diversity of input from workgroup members resulted in a range of policy options for the Council to consider and prioritize for inclusion in the Ten-Year Roadmap.

The Workgroup recommends that the Council consider each policy option in light of the following underlying principles:

1. Technology should only be used when it enhances student learning and improves learning outcomes. Technology should not be used simply for the sake of using technology and should not drive pedagogy.
2. Technology can and should be used to increase access and reduce costs. Digital content, open content, and widespread internet access provide enormous opportunities for students to access education, learn valuable content and skills, and save money.
3. Every institution has strengths to share. Students benefit when institutions cultivate sharing and coordination of professional development, research, open content, vendor contracts, and support services.
4. From early learning to graduate school and the workplace, educators and students need technology and digital literacy skills. Every Washington resident, including those with limited resources and those with disabilities, deserves an opportunity to acquire those skills.

The policy options below are intended to include both public and private sectors across the entire educational system, from early learning through postsecondary education.

Develop a Statewide P20 Educational Technology Consortium

The Council should convene an ongoing consortium that brings together educators, instructional technology specialists, librarians, and administrators from early learning, K12, and postsecondary education as well as employers and businesses. The Consortium should facilitate and synchronize activities including, but not limited to:
• Collaboration: identifying employer needs, developing and offering joint programs; sharing open educational materials; and capitalizing on the work of other regional and national efforts.
• Information Sharing: through websites, conferences and other venues where best practices, standards, and emerging models are shared.
• Professional Development: providing access to professional development opportunities and facilitating professional learning communities and mentoring.
• Financial: developing a voluntary compact to enhance purchasing options by leveraging buying power and securing statewide licensing for educational materials and technologies.

Provide Incentives to Support Adoption and Innovation
The Council should find ways to incent innovation and also support the wide-spread use of technologies and strategies that have been proven to enhance student learning. Approaches could include incentive funding and award programs.

Scale up Successful Innovations to Create National Assessment Models
The Council should partner with businesses or gaming companies that have experience analyzing “big data” to develop a model for using learning analytics to improve teaching and learning. Learning analytics are techniques for analyzing data to detect and decipher patterns of student behavior that provide real-time interventions to students and more timely information to instructors. The model should also incorporate methods for integrating data from a variety of data systems so that trends and patterns can be analyzed across multiple institutions or even statewide.

Next Steps
Following the Council’s consideration and discussion of these policy options at its July 2013 meeting, Council staff will prepare a framework for Roadmap recommendations for this planning area. This framework will include a delineation of specific strategic actions, each of which will be described by the following factors:

• Expected outcome of the action.
• Action time period.
• Outcome time period.
• Metrics for measuring outcomes.
• Legislative action needed.
• Fiscal impact.

The framework for Roadmap recommendations will be developed in close consultation with the Council members and workgroup members. The Council will use this framework at its fall retreat to help shape the Ten-Year Roadmap.
Appendix A

Lessons Learned from Workplace-Based e-Learning

On June 25, 2013, the Association of Washington Business Institute convened a stakeholder group to discuss workplace-based e-learning. This appendix to the Technology Policy Options report contains a brief overview of the lessons learned, recommendations, and discussions during that meeting. It is intended to serve as an additional resource to aid the Council in their understanding of the effective use of technology for teaching and learning. Additional information about the meeting and presentations is available upon request.

- An evaluation of three workplace-based learning laboratories designed to serve low-wage, lower-skilled adults determined that such models are effective; and that policymakers should find ways to support the expansion of workplace-based learning and its formalization in the workplace.\(^1\)
- Colleges and universities should: \(^3\)
  - Think strategically about the value added.
  - Find areas where the institution’s strengths align with employer needs.
  - Consider the resources necessary in relation to the resources available.
  - Be service-oriented.
  - Measure the effectiveness of programs and the satisfaction of participants and their employers.
  - Provide instruction in short, concise modules using a variety of technology platforms.
- Many Washington employers are currently interested in workplace-based e-learning programs and would enter into a partnership with a college or university. However, other employers are not yet sure if workplace-based e-learning programs are worth the investment. These employers would benefit from information demonstrating the tangible returns on an investment in such programs for their employees.

---

\(^1\) Siegerdt, C. (June 25, 2013). Notes from the Association of Washington Business Institute Special Stakeholder Meeting on Workplace-Based e-Learning on June 25, 2013
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