

TrustEd Apps™ Readiness Assessment

Ensuring that your edtech supports your mission to serve students.

Explore these key considerations when it comes to your technology:

- Considering something new?
- Is this technology duplicated elsewhere on campus?
- Does this app serve larger needs institution wide?
- Can these new or revised tools improve the user experience?
- Will the tool add efficiency or require more effort?
- Are we replacing existing tech or adding on to what we already have?

Evaluate your edtech use, and purchasing process.

This instrument is meant to be used to support an audit of your existing technology, to help inform the procurement of new tools and to assess professional development needs.

Feel free to use the assessment with your team to support your goals. The criteria follow the technology lifecycle from acquisition to use. Feel free to reverse the order, complete only one part or two parts of the rubric.

Reflect, plan and identify improvements.

The instrument could be used during a professional development or training session or during a departmental or unit retreat where a group comes together and evaluates their TrustEd Apps needs.

The intent of this exercise and accompanying rubric is not to achieve a Level 3 (highest level) on each area but rather, to help to understand the use of technology across a department/unit and to identify better ways to manage technology to improve your mission to serve learners.

What are TrustEd Apps?

TrustEd Apps Readiness is an approach to selecting, acquiring, implementing and sustaining technology applications that work together, are secure, accessible and share information to support continuous improvement as well as learning and operational efficiencies.

A group of technology applications make up your digital ecosystem. And just like anything in your "house", digital ecosystems need to be maintained to ensure they are functioning effectively, applications within it are connected, resourced appropriately and used for the purpose intended.

This document serves as the TrustEd Apps Readiness Assessment intended to help you advance the need and mindset of ensuring your technology serves your mission and provides efficiency in managing your operations; all to impact learner success.

The Assessment includes four section/areas of assessment related to TrustEd Apps Readiness. Within each of these tabs or components of the assessment are criteria associated with that area. Additionally, this instrument includes a comprehensive glossary to help clarify key terms and concepts ensuring you have all the information you need to get started.

We're always here to help.

Have questions on how to use the instrument with your team? Or need guidance on how TrustEd Apps management can support a seamless, more connected technology experience for your students, faculty and administration? Please contact: 1edtech.org/form/contact-us.

DESIGN TEAM

Suzanne Carbonaro

Director, Higher Education Programs, 1EdTech

Kelly Hoyland

Director, Higher Education Programs, 1EdTech

Rob Ditto

Technical Director for the IDEA Courseware Team, The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania

Sonya Watkins

Chief Information Officer, University of Central Oklahoma

Sherri Braxton Castanzo

Senior Director for Digital Innovation, Bowdoin College

Todd Van Zandt

Manager of Teaching and Learning Technology Services University of California, Davis

Gary Ritter

Executive Director - Digital Transformation & Business Relationship Management, Central Piedmont Community College

Loren Malm

VP for Information Technology, Ball State University

Patrick Miller

Team Lead, Learning Management System, University of Notre Dame

Andrew Cracker

Learning Analytics Specialist, University of Notre Dame

CDITECT		151510	151516
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Supports mission of erving learners	Technology is likely being used but it is unclear of how or the depth of use or if it is aligned with the mission of serving student learning.	Technology is being used to support the mission of serving learners.	Technology is being used to support the missic of serving learners and is tracked for impact, efficiencies and relevance for learners.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Oversight is present	No operationalized oversight of the technology.	One or two individuals in our dept/unit provide oversight; but they are not dedicated completely and it is more ad hoc.	There is clear operationalized governance in the dept/unit for decisions around use, features return on investment, and utility.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Impacts tudent learning outcomes	No impact tracking is occurring.	Some impact data is being collected but not widely used or shared.	Impact data is being collected and used to inform usage and improvements.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Interoperable/ Integrated	Technology is not integrated into the institutional ecosystem; meaning the technology is not connected to any other system but rather a stand alone tool.	Technology is integrated/connected within the Learning Management System or some other learning tool of record (e.g. ePortfolio system).	Technology is intentionally integrated across t institutional ecosystem, leveraging single-sign on, Learning Tools Interoperability (LTI®) and other open standards through organizations like 1EdTech to ensure seamless interoperabili
Comments:	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 2
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Learner experience	Have not engaged learners in their experiences using apps or even if the learners know how to use or access the technology to support them.	Barriers for learners have been identified but there is not a comprehensive plan to address the barriers.	Learners have no barriers to using application including receiving training and documentatio on how to use the applications to support the success. Regular follow up occurs.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Quality of data	Data is collected in silo and not shared widely in a data repository. There is not good way to track longitudinal data.	Limited data is collected but not shared widely across the unit/college/department nor the institution. Longitudinal data is limited because there is no process in place to pull and use data from multiple systems.	There is a clearly designed data initiative that includes access to meaningful data across the institution from multiple applications. Longitudinal data is robust but still is not wide used by stakeholders.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Continuous improvement process	No continuous improvement process in place for use and need for applications.	Continuous improvement process in place in some departments and units for tracking app usage and needs, but it is not an institution-wide effort and it is manual.	Continuous improvement process is in place to track app usage and needs across the institution. This helps to inform whether the application (sare still relevant and used as intended.
Comments:			

Page 3 of 9

TECHNOLO	GY FOR LEARNING Continued		
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Awareness	The tool(s) is accessible to most learners but other barriers such as required operating system or cost have not been considered and could keep some learners from using the application(s).	The tool(s) accessibility has been considered and is currently under review for other obstacles of use.	Technology is being used for discipline specific reasons and there is awareness of this technology across other departments and units. There is collaboration on use, best practices and even discussion on how this technology could be used institution-wide or that it is available for adoption.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Application use	Only a small fraction of the application is being used for a specific purpose.	Application is being used but not fully; some the application's functionality is not being utilized or is duplicated in other existing tools.	Application is being used effectively; there is not duplication of this functionality elsewhere at the institution.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Learner Access	The ability for all learners to access the tool only includes accessibility and not other barriers like technology requirements.	The ability for learners to be able to access the tool has been considered but does not include a comprehensive plan.	The ability for all learners to be able to access the tool has been considered including the cost of required technology and accessibility and there is a plan in place to remove any challenges.
Comments:			

ECHNOLO	GY FOR OPERATIONS		
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Supports efficiency in advancing strategic priorities	Technology is being used but it is unclear of impact of use or inhibits efficiency.	Technology is being used to advance strategic priorities but maybe not be efficient.	Technology is being used to advance strategic priorities and being tracked for impact and efficiencies.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Oversight is present	No operationalized oversight of the technology.	One or two individuals in our dept/unit provide oversight; but they are not dedicated completely and it is more ad hoc.	There is clear operationalized oversight in the dept/unit for the use and sustainability of technology including training/professional development and resource documentation; this oversight is a dedicated resource to support the use, training and other activities associated with the technology.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Interoperable	Technology is not integrated into the institutional ecosystem.	Technology has limited integration within the enterprise technology systems.	Technology is intentionally integrated across t institutional ecosystem, leveraging single-sign on, Learning Tools Interoperability (LTI) and other open standards through organizations lil 1EdTech to ensure seamless interoperability.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
User experience	Have not engaged users in their experiences using applications.	Have received some feedback from user but it was not part of a larger engagement effort.	Users have no barriers to using applications and are engaged in providing feedback for continuous improvement.
Comments:		,	
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Quality of data	Data is collected in silo within the unit or department and not shared widely.	Limited data is collected but not shared widely across the institution because there is no process in place to pull and use data from multiple systems.	There is a clearly designed data initiative that includes access to meaningful data across the institution from multiple applications allowing longitudinal decisions to be made.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Continuous improvement process	No continuous improvement process in place for use and need for applications.	Continuous improvement process in place in some departments and units for tracking app usage and needs, but it is not an institution-wide effort and it is manual.	Continuous improvement process is in place to track app usage and needs across the institution
Comments:			
	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
CRITERIA			
Application use	Only a small fraction of the application is being used for a specific purpose.	Application is being used but not fully; some of the application's functionality is not being utilized or is duplicated in other existing tools.	Application is being used but not fully; some of the application's functionality is not being utilized or is duplicated in other existing tools.

CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Operationalized effort	No formal professional development process in	Operationalized effort is in place but not widely	Operationalized effort is in place, participation
Comments:	place for technology best practices and use.	utilized by academic and administrative units.	high and effectiveness is tracked.
Comments.			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Resources allocation	Not enough resources are allocated to this effort.	Resource allocation is present for most professional experiences, but is not always Z utilized and reallocated for other initiatives.	Resource allocation is appropriate and increases with need.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Continuous improvement process	No formal continuous improvement process for revising professional development.	Continuous improvement process in place in some departments and units, but it is not an institution-wide effort.	Institution-wide continuous improvement process is in place to revise existing professional development offerings and to identify new offerings.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Recognized	No consistent recognition or incentive plan.	Each department or unit has a plan for incentives and recognition plan for their staff.	Organization wide plan includes incentives, recognition plan, and provides a digital credent ial for all faculty and staff.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Talent pipeline	No clear pathways for how staff can upskill for new positions; staff may not be in the right roles, or there are roles missing from institution that could provide benefit in maintaining a TrustEd App Ecosystem.	Limited pathways are identified for staff to gain skills needed for new positions; some staff audits are being done, but there is not a widespread initiative to ensure upskilling is in place.	Clear pathways are identified for staff (including student employees) to gain skills needed for new positions; upskilling is in progress with a formalized framework for ensuring current staff is engaged in skills sets required and accompanying training linked to the institutional strategic plan
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Vendor Documentation and Training	Vendor provides minimal resources for support and training.	Vendor provides a set of resources for support and training but more help is needed and there is a cost associated with additional vendor trainings.	Vendor provides a robust set of resources for support and training that are easily accessible by all stakeholders. These resources are update as new releases of the product are made and training is available at no additional cost.

ROCUREM	IENT CONSIDERATIONS		
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
RFP/RFI Committee Structure	Formal committee structure is not always leveraged due to budget or resources.	Formal committee structure is required and present for evaluation of products, however there is not a wide institutional representation or it is only leveraged for large scale purchases	Formal committee structure is required and present for evaluation of products with representation and expertise across the institution for vetting of solutions.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Consistent contract language	There is not standard, consistent language for RFP/RFI that we are aware of. Discussion with IT and Procurement offices is required.	Consistent contract language as required by the State is in place but is often broad and requires review. Oversight from procurement and IT is required.	Consistent contract language is in place including State requirements and provides a good foundation for vetting of products for purchast through an RFP/RFI; Procurement and IT aid in the process for revision and support.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Accessibility	Institutional accessibility requirements are in place but only leveraged for some applications; further inquiry needed with Accessibility Office or IT.	Institutional accessibility requirements are in place; there is a need to align the product accessibility and institutional accessibility	Institutional accessibility requirements are in place and required for vetting products. There is a good process and resources in place
	inquiry needed with Accessibility Office of 11.	requirements.	to move the procurement process forward in timely fashion
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1		to move the procurement process forward in a timely fashion
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	requirements. LEVEL 2	timely fashion LEVEL 3
		requirements.	timely fashion
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1 Institutional security requirements for products are in place; have not checked or aligned technology security practices with institutional	LEVEL 2 Institutional security requirements are a part of the procurement process, but monitoring changes and documenting them for discussion and future	LEVEL 3 Institutional security requirements are actively monitored and shared. Discussion about changes to security practices and
CRITERIA Security Comments:	LEVEL 1 Institutional security requirements for products are in place; have not checked or aligned technology security practices with institutional	LEVEL 2 Institutional security requirements are a part of the procurement process, but monitoring changes and documenting them for discussion and future	LEVEL 3 Institutional security requirements are actively monitored and shared. Discussion about changes to security practices and
CRITERIA Security	LEVEL 1 Institutional security requirements for products are in place; have not checked or aligned technology security practices with institutional requirements.	LEVEL 2 Institutional security requirements are a part of the procurement process, but monitoring changes and documenting them for discussion and future renewals is not practiced.	LEVEL 3 Institutional security requirements are actively monitored and shared. Discussion about changes to security practices and ongoing conversations with suppliers occurs. LEVEL 3 Data privacy requirements are actively monitored and shared. Discussion about
CRITERIA Security Comments:	LEVEL 1 Institutional security requirements for products are in place; have not checked or aligned technology security practices with institutional requirements. LEVEL 1 Data privacy for products are in place; have not checked or aligned technology privacy practices	LEVEL 2 Institutional security requirements are a part of the procurement process, but monitoring changes and documenting them for discussion and future renewals is not practiced. LEVEL 2 Data privacy requirements are a part of the procurement process, but monitoring changes and documenting them for discussion and future	LEVEL 3 Institutional security requirements are actively monitored and shared. Discussion about changes to security practices and ongoing conversations with suppliers occurs. LEVEL 3 Data privacy requirements are actively monitored and shared. Discussion about changes to technology's privacy practices and
CRITERIA Security Comments: CRITERIA Data Privacy	LEVEL 1 Institutional security requirements for products are in place; have not checked or aligned technology security practices with institutional requirements. LEVEL 1 Data privacy for products are in place; have not checked or aligned technology privacy practices	LEVEL 2 Institutional security requirements are a part of the procurement process, but monitoring changes and documenting them for discussion and future renewals is not practiced. LEVEL 2 Data privacy requirements are a part of the procurement process, but monitoring changes and documenting them for discussion and future	LEVEL 3 Institutional security requirements are actively monitored and shared. Discussion about changes to security practices and ongoing conversations with suppliers occurs. LEVEL 3 Data privacy requirements are actively monitored and shared. Discussion about changes to technology's privacy practices and

CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Interoperability	Alignment to open standards is not included in the process.	Alignment to open standards is included as a preferred criteria in the process.	Alignment to specific open standards is included as a required criteria in the process and the institution has signed the 1Edtech's TrustEd Apps Pledge to ensure that applications procured will adhere to the interoperability standards.
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Licensing/Cost	Students have to pay for the application and the license is purchased by them directly for a specific timeframe/ and renewal options.	Licensing is by college, unit or department, has a term of 3-5 years and is based on Student FTE.	Site license is institutional wide based on Student FTE and is paid by institution through a specific contract which limits the % of price increases over a term of 3 to 5 years or annually
Comments:			
CRITERIA	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Data ownership/ transferability	Contract does not specify when an institution can access and retrieve their data and in what format.	Contract stipulates that institution is able to get their data back but may require additional costs or extended time and the format of the data may not be ideal.	Contract stipulates that institution is able to get their data back at any point out without additional charges. The data format is consumable by institutional data architecture.
Comments:			
Comments:	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
	LEVEL 1 Procurement decision is based only on meeting minimum requirements and pricing.	LEVEL 2 Procurement decisions include a holistic review but pricing is weighted the highest.	LEVEL 3 Procurement decisions are based on a holistic review including items such as functionality, security, support, and pricing.
CRITERIA Best solution	Procurement decision is based only on meeting	Procurement decisions include a holistic review	Procurement decisions are based on a holistic review including items such as functionality,
CRITERIA Best solution not best price	Procurement decision is based only on meeting	Procurement decisions include a holistic review	Procurement decisions are based on a holistic review including items such as functionality,
CRITERIA Best solution not best price Comments:	Procurement decision is based only on meeting minimum requirements and pricing.	Procurement decisions include a holistic review but pricing is weighted the highest.	Procurement decisions are based on a holistic review including items such as functionality, security, support, and pricing.
CRITERIA Best solution not best price Comments:	Procurement decision is based only on meeting minimum requirements and pricing. LEVEL 1 Resources in addition to acquisition costs are not	Procurement decisions include a holistic review but pricing is weighted the highest. LEVEL 2 Additional resources such as infrastructure or staffing is considered in enterprise wide	Procurement decisions are based on a holistic review including items such as functionality, security, support, and pricing. LEVEL 3 All impacted resources and ongoing costs such as infrastructure or staffing resources have been considered and included in the
CRITERIA Best solution not best price Comments: CRITERIA Resourcing	Procurement decision is based only on meeting minimum requirements and pricing. LEVEL 1 Resources in addition to acquisition costs are not	Procurement decisions include a holistic review but pricing is weighted the highest. LEVEL 2 Additional resources such as infrastructure or staffing is considered in enterprise wide	Procurement decisions are based on a holistic review including items such as functionality, security, support, and pricing. LEVEL 3 All impacted resources and ongoing costs such as infrastructure or staffing resources have been considered and included in the

Accessibility

Accessibility is about designing web sites, applications, technologies, tools, products and services in an inclusive manner, and thus lifting barriers to communication and interaction that many people face in the physical world. Products and services that have inclusive design are accessible and usable by all without special modification or design. Accessibility legislation seeks to remove barriers to the online learning experience. Legislation is based on the W3C WCAG 2.0 guidelines and informed by independent international standards experts.

<u>1edtech.org/standards/accessibility</u> w3.org/mission/accessibility/

Security

Security is the process of safeguarding digital information throughout its entire life cycle to protect it from corruption, theft, or unauthorized access. This includes data that passed from one system or app to another. Data security helps institution to protect its information and its users from being stolen, lost, or ending up in the wrong hands. 1EdTech's TrustEd Apps™ Security Practices Rubric Specification 1.0 and self-assessment process were developed to meet the increasing needs of educational leaders so they can understand and mitigate security risks within their teaching and learning environment and accelerate their procurement processes.

1edtech.org/standards/security-practices-rubric

Data Quality

Data quality is a measure of a data set's condition based on factors such as accuracy, completeness, consistency, reliability and validity. It is a critical aspect of data management, ensuring that the data used for analysis, reporting, and decision-making is reliable and trustworthy.

Generative AI

Generative Artificial Intelligence or Gen AI refers to the use of AI to create content like text, images, music, audio and video. Gen AI is powered by large AI models that can answer questions, provide information, summarization, and perform a variety of tasks through prompting. The TrustEd Apps Generative AI Data Rubric was developed to provide a foundation for the ethical, productive, and safe use of Gen-AI data in the field of education. It addresses disclosure policies and transparency and encourages the examination of data, such as a declaration that AI is in use, opt-in/opt-out, quality of data sources, bias controls, and data ownership.

1edtech.org/standards/ai-rubric

Learning Tools Interoperability (LTI)

1EdTech's LTI standard is a technical standard (not a product) used to connect learning tools with an institution's learning environment without logging into each tool. LTI supports a high level of security for passing data about the users, their institutional enrollment, and roles.

1edtech.org/standards/lti

TrustEd Apps Pledge

To help school districts, higher education institutions, departments of education, and suppliers ensure that we are truly working together to develop, promote, implement and evolve open standards, the 1EdTech community is asking all sector participants to consider becoming a public endorser of the following pledge to ensure the lasting success of open standards in edtech.

Governance

A comprehensive governance audit encompasses all digital platforms and can help diagnose the effectiveness of workflows, processes, training and planning, as well as the clarity of your roles and ownership of tools within a digital ecosystem.

Interoperability

Interoperable (interoperability) means that different devices, software, or systems can communicate with each other and exchange data. For example, a smartphone and a computer can be interoperable if they can both use the same type of file format. This means that you can easily transfer files from your phone to your computer, or vice versa. Interoperability is important because it makes it easier to use different technologies together. For example, if you have a smart home with a variety of different devices, such as a thermostat, a doorbell, and a security system, you want to be able to control them all from a single app. If the devices are interoperable, you can do this.

TrustEd Applications

TrustEd Apps is a standards first program aimed at facilitating digital ecosystem interoperability.

The program consists of three key components:

Continuous support services, including targeted technical resources and training for both edtech suppliers and school districts. A new compatibility certification for edtech suppliers and school districts enabling verification of live product integrations. A pledge of support for making open standards the first and primary choice for integrations.

1edtech.org/program/trustedapps

Learning Management System (LMS)

A learning management system (LMS) or virtual learning environment (VLE) is a software application for the administration, documentation, tracking, reporting, automation, and delivery of educational courses, training programs, materials or learning and development programs. The role of a Learning Management System (LMS) varies depending on an organization's objectives, online training strategy, and desired outcomes. However, the most common use of an LMS is to deploy and track online teaching, learning, and training activities. Typically, digital content or links to digital content are uploaded to the learning management system, which makes them easily accessible for remote learners. In many cases, the LMS, through standards-based integrations, allows the development, management, distribution, and use of online content through third-party applications and tools. The LMS is sometimes referred to as a virtual learning environment (VLE).

Technical Standards

Technical standards are guidelines or protocols that define how different technologies or systems should communicate and interact with each other, ensuring seamless data exchange and compatibility.

1EdTech's mission is to provide open technical specifications or standards to:

- Provide institutions with the ability to design and build connected digital ecosystems based on their needs, to include: seamless access/authentication, data privacy/security, data collection, credit portability that includes evidence of learning.
- Ensure the development of these standards includes contributions from education field's stakeholders, including education leaders and technical experts from higher education, K-12 districts and states' departments of education, and digital platform and tools' suppliers.

Digital Ecosystem

A technology infrastructure that includes applications, platforms and tools that coexist through a coordinated exchange of resources across an institution. A healthy digital ecosystem is one where its components are connected through standards of interoperability, accessible, secure and resource efficient.

insidehighered.com/opinion/blogs/call-action/2024/08/22/time-reckoning-your-digital-ecosystem

Student Information System

Student information system (SIS) is a web-based system of record used by institutions to store and organize data about their students. It can contain an array of functionalities related to the student learning journey like admissions, enrollment, course scheduling, performance tracking and financing. 1EdTech's standard Edu-API will allow for the standardized exchange of data between the transactional systems that manage higher education administration and teaching and learning. That means not only increased efficiency on campus but also the facilitation of the development of a new generation of smart, sustainable apps, personalized based on data about the student shared in a secure and responsible way.

1edtech.org/standards/edu-api

Data Privacy

Educational applications are designed and managed by edtech suppliers who attempt to protect the user's privacy. However, educational institutions are responsible for reviewing data collection, third-party data sharing, and advertising practices to ensure appropriate safeguards. Rigorous vetting of these edtech apps can provide additional assurance that the information gathered by these educational applications is being used responsibly. The student's privacy, data security, or other safety considerations implemented by suppliers when developing educational tools may not match the needs of an institution; thus, it is the responsibility of the institution to ensure required student data safeguards are in place.

1edtech.org/standards/data-privacy