**Collaborative and Participatory Approach to Quality Preparation for Interveners: Development, Delivery and Sustainability of Training Modules**

**First Cycle of Field Testing- Modules 1-4- February- April, 2013**

* NCDB Designed Survey Used In Two Cycles of Field Testing Examined 4 Domains of User Experience: Technical, Content, Activities & Applications; Assessment
* 5 point Likert scale; Open ended response area-”what worked well, what could be improved, and any suggestions you have for making these improvements.”
* Moodle 2.23 Mechanism for Delivering Content

**Field Test Participants and Expert Reviewers:**

There were 33 field participants representing 11 states including: AK, AL, CA, GA, IN, NE, OH, PA, KY, TN, WV

Field participants included: parents of children who are deaf-blind, paraeducators, teachers, related service providers, and administrators. Field reviewers included 18 experts from 15 states and a variety of settings: IHEs, state DB projects, interveners, and teachers.

**Field Test Results Modules 1-4**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module** | **Technical** | **Content** | **Activities** | **Assessment** |
| 1 | 81.3% | 100% | 84% | 90% |
| 2 | 75.6% | 97.7% | 79.3% | 94.5% |
| 3 | 93.8% | 97.5% | 92.5% | 98% |
| 4 | 77.4% | 95.3% | 90.3% | 97.5% |

**External Reviews from the U of Colorado Denver independently analyzed field test data.**

Qualitative data were coded line-by-line using the constant-comparative analysis. Several changes were made based upon analysis. Conducted analysis of all prompts used in directions, learning outcomes, activities, and quizzes to determine types and levels of reflection (e.g. Bloom’s Taxonomy) and clarity.

**Second Field Test Modules 5-8 From November, 2013- March, 2014**

There were 22 field participants who registered representing 10 states including: IL, NE, TN, AK, SD, PA, DC, TX, GA, OK.

Field participants included: parents of children who are deaf-blind, paraeducators, teachers, related service providers, and administrators. Twenty expert reviewers were also recruited to review modules.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module** | **Technical** | **Content** | **Activities** | **Assessment** |
| 5 | 88.9% | 98.6% | 95.4% | 93.2% |
| 6 | 97.2% | 98.6% | 100% | 97.8% |
| 7 | 95.3% | 100% | 97.9% | 97.4% |
| 8 | 95.8% | 100% | 100% | 96.7% |

Qualitative data indicates greater satisfaction and richer application of the learning activities by adult learners.

A second Bloom’s Taxonomy and CEC Alignment meeting is scheduled for the Fall, 2014 to further align data.

After the first four modules had been revised and clarified, several state deaf-blind projects, as well as a few universities, requested to use replicas of the modules with specific groups. NCDB hosted copies of these modules for the groups on their server and provided technical assistance, both for using the Moodle technology and aligning the use of the modules with the partner’s plan for outreach.

This use was a deeper level of field testing and has led to further improvements and revisions with the modules.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **State Partner- Implementing Modules** | **Purpose for Using Modules** | **Approximate Number of People Reached** |
| Illinois Deaf-Blind Project | Promote Statewide Awareness of Interveners  Cost Effectiveness of Outreach | 53 |
| Washington Deaf-Blind Project | Distance Based Technical Assistance  Outreach | 27 |
| California Deaf-Blind Services in Partnership with ID & MT | Knowledge Development  Work with School Teams  Offer Some Credits through Partnership with University | 20+ |
| Georgia Deaf-Blind Project- UGA | State Program Development  Awareness of Administrators | 15 |
| Virginia Project for Children and Young Adults who are Deaf-Blind | Prerequisite to receiving some TA  Outreach and Awareness Building | 70+ |
| New York Deaf-Blind Collaborative  Vermont | Team Based Training  Some Customization of Modules | 22 |

State adopters feedback on the quality relevance and usefulness of the OHOA modules has been high. They also have provided a deeper level of review as instructors and hosts. Here is a summary of some of their advice from using the modules which is being used to make revisions in all modules this summer.

**Give the learner permission to look at something critically.**

**Provide more context for videos and images**

**Allow the discussion boards to have more open-ended questions**

**Be explicit with any assignment**

**Provide more videos of interveners in inclusive settings**

**Provide a way for the learner to review the learning outcomes.**