Process components for submission and validation of multi-state E-learning products*

I. VALIDATION OF STANDARDS
a. Easy-to-follow product development format for use with SCORM-compliant meta-tags.
b. Clearly defined meta-tags with examples provided with authoring software.
c. Meta-tag compliance evaluation
   i. Objective descriptors will have auto-selection with drop-down menus (i.e.: Catalog, entry, date, typical age, etc.)
   ii. Subjective descriptors will require review by an evaluation team. These may have auto-selection with drop-down menus but agreement on class-selection must be reached (i.e.: interactivity level, difficulty, keyword, etc.)

II. IMPLEMENTATION (System Use Training)
A. Training in knowledge and understanding of submission and meta-tag standards and the submission process
   i. Face-to-face train-the-trainer sessions of teams representing each state/region
   ii. On-line tutorials and/or instructional development software that “walks” author through the integration process.
B. SCORM compliant products will become the standard

III. PEER REVIEW
a. Technical review of content and editorial review completed prior to submission.
b. SCORM compliance review conducted by designated teams
   i. Timeline for review
   ii. SCORM review criteria and process described
c. Revision if necessary
d. Acceptance and submission

IV. MARKETING
a. Needs assessment to determine products
b. Benefits to submitters and users clearly defined
c. Required resources identified
d. Key players and user demographics identified
e. Buy-in process described
f. Potential funding sources identified
g. Recognition and identity process maintained
h. Incentive process established
i. Evaluation and impact statements used in promotion
j. Well developed RFP

*NOTE: This is archived information and may not represent the current status of CECP.
V. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
   A. Clearly described process and content
      i. Who can submit
      ii. Who is the audience
      iii. Product topics and/or issues described
      iv. Timeline detailed
      v. Application requirements described
      vi. RFP review process and notification described
      vii. Submitter responsibilities described
   B. Resources to support RFP’s and subsequent product development identified.

VI. PROGRAM LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE
   A. Document commitment to E-learning initiative
   B. Resolve ownership/recognition issues concerning E-Learning products
   C. Develop rationale (cost/benefit) for regionalizing/nationalizing the Extension information system incorporating E-Learning products
   D. Resolve the issue of closed VS open “intranet” state systems (excluding reports and systems management information).
   E. Serve as E-Learning systems advisory group.

*NOTE: This is archived information and may not represent the current status of CECP.*