Timeline:
Oct 24 - Feb 1

Evaluation Components:
1. **Teacher Survey**
2. **Usage Reports "Data Clicks"**
3. **Student Achievement Results** (From IL Reports)
4. **Classroom Observations** - Ogden, Hazel Dell, Minnehaha, Anderson, Roosevelt, King
5. **Student Interviews** (conducted during site visits)

Ease of Use for Students & Teachers

Access to and navigation within the Imagine Learning platform is simple and intuitive for students, even in Kindergarten and 1st grade. The DET observed transitions of students in grades K-5, and in all settings students clearly know what to do upon arriving at the Imagine Learning station, rarely requiring any support from staff in getting started. If students encounter technical hiccups during their experience, most schools have identified an onsite staff assistant supporting IL to respond and fix: this occurred an average of 1-2 times per observed IL session and were generally related to headphone/sound issues. At all ages and settings, student movement through lessons is nearly flawless, primarily because of the skill progression and developmentally-appropriate design of the digital lessons.

The platform assigns each student to his/her individual learning pathway based on initial student performance on a placement assessment. While this makes student navigation and experience easy, it causes some challenges in conventional planning processes for teachers. When asked, teachers generally rated the platform with high marks in ease of use, noting that the tool was easy to navigate and operate, was not complicated or difficult to understand. The one area of difficult navigation for teachers (and administrators) is the report functionality. Teachers reported challenges in using these reports, and the DET team confirmed that the task of accessing data, particularly aggregate information, was extremely time-consuming. Individual student-level reports are significantly more relevant than group or grade level data.

Student Engagement, Agency, & Ownership

Blended Learning Experiences

To evaluate the strength of blended learning experiences, we considered primarily "how" VPS staff are implementing the program with respect to broadly researched elements of blended learning instruction. For example, the program itself exhibits some strength in path and pace, but VPS guidelines and realities for implementation have some restrictions on time and place that students can access learning with IL. In five of six sites, the VPS guidance to include small group instruction was observed, oftentimes 1:1 or 2:1 and inclusive of progress monitoring assessments. In the sixth, it was quite evident that too many students were assigned to IL sessions to manage small or individual group instruction. In some cases the teacher used the IL teacher dashboard and embedded intervention resources, in other cases a multitude of familiar resources and strategies were leveraged.

In five of six sites visited, teachers regularly reported constraints with managing the time allotted for IL computer-led instruction and small group instruction as use of the program is limited to 25-minute intervention sessions with LAP-funded staff (as a supplement to core instruction). (In the sixth site, Hazel Dell, Imagine Learning is being implemented as a school-wide program and not during intervention time). When used as an intervention, the program is housed in a single location within the building, requiring a large amount of coordination and scheduling. Most staff noted that once the group schedules are established, they rarely change. Staff consistently noted that the intensity of logistical coordination, set-up, and overall management of the program.

Teacher as Designer

The majority of teachers express concern that they are "blind" to the content being presented to students; meaning that the alignment to standards isn't explicitly labeled within the lessons themselves. Also, review of the lessons and navigation of the embedded reports are extremely time-consuming. When generated, the reports themselves are lacking in instructional relevancy in their current form. For teachers who organize instructional plans based on the concept of "coverage" by curricular resources, this presents a challenge. However, in a few instances of observed instruction, the lead Imagine Learning teacher organized instruction solely through formative assessment, responding to what students demonstrated in a one-on-one or small group setting, leveraging strategies and pulling discreet curricular resources to scaffold support not only for one skill, but for the interrelated skills and the next level of interrelated skills. The lead teacher at Hazel Dell Elementary is an exemplary model of these instructional skills and practices. In the site observation, she was able to describe the specific skills--ie, which paired vowels and digraphs-- that were consistently challenging for students. As we think of teacher as designer, this example of starting the design process based on student demonstration of standards instead of instructional coverage of standards is worth consideration.

effective in addressing gaps for these students, it will be effective *quickly*, meaning that students do not need to spend an entire year in the platform. It's recommended that students exit the program after acquiring the foundational skills that end after grade 1, (this means students generally would not spend more than 12 weeks in that platform for intervention support).

3) **Support ELL Learners, 3-5:** When students complete the foundational skills aligned to Grade 1, they move on to grammar and grade level reading. This progression into grammar is appropriate for ELL students at these grade level, and using IL for this purpose is appropriate.

4) **Strengthen teachers' capacity to support struggling readers.** No reading intervention program will be successful unless individual teachers have both the skillset and opportunity to support struggling readers. VPS would benefit as a system with an investment in intervention teachers' knowledge of language acquisition, developmental stages, and formative assessment around early literacy skills. Such an investment might first target 30-40 certified teachers over a two-year period (which requires buildings to maintain consistent staff assignments in these roles).

5) **Access at Home:** Currently, students are not allowed to access Imagine Learning at home due to district policies. We encourage reviewing this policy and considering the conditions that home access might benefit students.