

Chapter Six

Evaluating Digital Learning Resources

Companion Materials

To support the critical work of evaluating digital tools for young learners, the resources in this section extend the frameworks and strategies introduced in Chapter Six. These curated checklists, rubrics, and research-informed models provide practical pathways for analyzing educational technology through the lenses of engagement, accessibility, and equity.

1. Frameworks & Evaluation Tools

- Triple E Framework: Evaluate how well digital tools engage, enhance, and extend learning.
Visit: <https://www.tripleeframework.com/>
- PICRAT Model: Explore how digital tools support creativity, interactivity, and transformation in learning. Overview:
https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/learningteachingconsulting/2023/02/02/picrat-a-model-for-analyzing-classroom-technology-integration/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

2. Interactive Tools & Rubrics

- EdTech Evidence Exchange: A curated database of vetted educational technology with peer feedback.
Visit: <https://edtechevidence.org>
- What Works Clearinghouse: Research-backed edtech tools and programs.
Visit: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>
- Common Sense Education Reviews: Reviews, lesson plans, and privacy evaluations for hundreds of tools.
Visit: <https://www.commonsense.org/education>

3. Videos & Media

- Triple E Framework for Technology Integration:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Z7Ulj6lL5k>
- Triple E Framework and Biomes Lesson from The Digital Promise:
<https://lvp.digitalpromiseglobal.org/my-workspaces/4W6dotUGgF>

5. Checklists & Templates

- ***Classroom EdTech Evaluation Rubric (Triple E-based)***

This rubric helps teachers evaluate classroom technology tools based on three criteria from the Triple E Framework:

1. Engagement: Does the tool actively engage students in learning?
 - High – Interactive, focused, and limits distraction
 - Medium – Engaging but with passive elements
 - Low – Primarily passive or entertainment-based

2. Enhancement: Does the tool deepen understanding of content?
 - High – Allows for personalization or supports conceptual clarity
 - Medium – Reinforces learning with minimal differentiation
 - Low – Redundant or replaces traditional tools
3. Extension: Does the tool connect learning to real-world contexts?
 - High – Promotes transfer, connects to home/community
 - Medium – Some real-world relevance
 - Low – Confined to classroom without transferability

• ***Inclusive Digital Tool Checklist (adapted from SEFE)***

Use this checklist to evaluate whether a digital tool supports identity, agency, and equity in Learning.

- Supports multilingual learners
- Includes diverse cultural representations
- Provides multiple ways to demonstrate learning
- Adaptive for different ability levels (e.g., IEP/504)
- Encourages student choice and voice
- Respects privacy and data protection norms
- Enables collaborative engagement among peers

• ***Reflection Journal: Weekly Log for Observing Student Engagement***

Use this weekly journal to log classroom observations and reflect on tool effectiveness.

- Week of: _____
- Tool Used: _____
- Purpose of Use: _____
- What signs of student engagement did I observe?
 - ☐ Focused attention ☐ Peer collaboration ☐ Curiosity
 - ☐ Self-directed behavior ☐ Critical thinking ☐ Creative expression
- Were there disengaged learners? What might have contributed?
- Did the tool support my instructional goals?
- What modifications might I try next week?