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MEL Framework
Set of questions and indicators for measuring and evaluating...

for Technology Supported
[Events] conducted entirely using technology (ie Virtual group meetings)

or were enhanced by technology (ie online learning modules used by groups of teachers)...

Remote Trainings
Broadly defined as any professional development activity that was conducted with some or all facilitators/participants in a different location
Problem Statement

- Existing evidence on remote training from Global North, higher education, or focuses on technology as a supplement.
- Over-simplified “with/without” evaluations at scale – inconclusive, lose nuance at scale. Need formative, process-oriented, contextually specific evaluations.
- With increasing demand, increasing need to examine issues of access, equity, quality, timeframe pressure and scaling, cost.
Conceptual Framework

The Teacher Learning Journey and Considerations for Effective Technology Use

- **Readiness**: Teachers become aware of the link between their practice and student learning and opportunities for enhancement.

- **Content Delivery**: Teachers experience, absorb, build mental models and make connections with new information.

- **Application**: Teachers apply new knowledge and skills in the classroom.

- **Sustaining**: Teachers sustain new practices over time.

**Fit to Purpose** → **Reach and Access** → **Engagement** → **Outcomes** → **Sustainability**
Framework Review and Testing

Phase 1 Testing:
- Map monitoring data from past program trainings to FW Indicators
- Programs use FW questions to plan future interviews

Phase 2 Testing:
Use indicators to develop/ inform follow up surveys (3 trainings)

Initial Development
- Internal Peer Review
- Final Review and Revisions
## Framework Review and Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Technology/ functionality</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Test recall</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Audio or video lecture</th>
<th>Video explainer</th>
<th>Share video</th>
<th>Summative evaluation</th>
<th>Synchronous session(s)</th>
<th>Asynchronous on demand</th>
<th>Peer exchange</th>
<th>Persistent (can revisit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>🟡</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>🟡</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>🟡</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five Essential Considerations

Fit to Purpose
Design and technology respond to gaps the training seeks to address and to the needs and resources of the target population.

- Purpose
- Target Audience
- Content Parameters
- Instructional Design
- Dosage/duration

Reach and Access
All intended users are able to access technology, training activities and resources.

- Access – User Needs
- Reach

Engagement
Training is implemented and received as intended, is relevant, and is captivating to users.

- Communication
- User Testing
- Participation Fidelity
- Satisfaction/Perceived Value

Outcomes
Technology-supported approaches result in learning and behavior change.

- Learning
- Behavior Change

Organizational Performance + Sustainability
Technology-supported approaches can be planned for, maintained, and improved on by government or other entities.

- Capacity
- Cost
- Resources
Two Sections

GUIDING QUESTIONS for planning and measuring training

This section is for team leaders who are implementing a training that is remote or using any type of technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Content Parameters</th>
<th>Include this question in training plans and discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 How will the training content respond directly to the needs that this training is addressing? (See Purpose – a1 – pg 1)</td>
<td>✗ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Does it make sense, or is it possible, to employ hardcopy materials? When and how?</td>
<td>✓ ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Does it make sense, or is it possible, to employ communications technology (e.g., SMS, text messaging, phone, Zoom, Facebook)? When and how?</td>
<td>✗ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Does it make sense, or is it possible, to employ knowledge- or content-sharing technology (e.g., Google Classroom, Moodle course, Tangerine)? When and how?</td>
<td>✓ ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 What infrastructure considerations or limitations should you consider when selecting technology for this activity?</td>
<td>✓ ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Will you have opportunities to use the available technology for 1) retrieving and playing videos, 2) managing tasks or assignments, or 3) conducting assessments?</td>
<td>✓ ✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDICATORS for monitoring, evaluation and learning

This section is for team leaders who are implementing a training that is remote or using any type of technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Learning</th>
<th>Indicate this indicator in monitoring and evaluation for training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Proportion of surveyed participants who report improved attitudes toward the content of the training (e.g., differentiation, inclusion, student feedback)</td>
<td>✗ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Proportion of surveyed participants who report increased levels of self-efficacy in implementing practices targeted by the training</td>
<td>✗ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Proportion of surveyed participants who report that their training participation contributed to their professional growth in areas targeted by the training</td>
<td>✗ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Average amount of time (in minutes) participants take to complete or pass a self-directed learning module or unit</td>
<td>✗ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Proportion of surveyed participants who demonstrate improved content knowledge from pre-training test to post-training test</td>
<td>✗ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Proportion of surveyed participants who pass the training exit test</td>
<td>✗ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps


Collect

Focus on Learning/Application
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