



Project Management Plan: Designing an Instructionally Effective Web-Based Training Program for CECAS

MIT 520 - Murdock - Fall 2007

Ian Jones
12/5/2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Executive Summary</u>	3-4
<u>Project Scope</u>	4-10
• <u>Problem Statement</u>	4
• <u>Information Gathering</u>	4
○ <u>Project Structure</u>	4-5
○ <u>Training Goals</u>	5-6
○ <u>Perceived Needs</u>	7
○ <u>Budget Analysis</u>	7-8
• <u>Gap Analysis</u>	9-10
<u>Project Planning</u>	11-16
• <u>Deliverables</u>	11
• <u>Benefits</u>	11
• <u>Constraints</u>	12
• <u>Alternative Analysis</u>	12-14
• <u>Resource Needs</u>	15-16
○ <u>Project Team</u>	15
○ <u>Non-personnel Resources</u>	16
○ <u>Proposed Budget</u>	16
<u>Evaluation Procedures</u>	17
• <u>Formative Evaluation</u>	17
• <u>Summative Evaluation</u>	17
<u>Risk Identification and Assessment</u>	18-20
• <u>Risk Assessment</u>	18
• <u>Communication Plan</u>	18
• <u>Schedule Control Plan</u>	19-20
<u>Project Work</u>	21-23
• <u>Work Breakdown Structure</u>	21-23
• <u>Milestones</u>	23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CECAS is a web-based database application created by a contracted software company for the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's (NCDPI) Exceptional Children Division (EC). The overall goal of the CECAS application is to create a statewide database of student information to comply with state and federal reporting. In addition, the application should reduce the amount of time spent on paperwork for Local Education Agencies (LEA/school district), facilitating student transfers, changes to procedure and policies of mandated paperwork, local reporting and other tasks that have previously required a tremendous amount of time and countless hours of paperwork.

All of the training has been conducted in a face-to-face format by the regional trainers. Due to a dramatic increase in travel costs, school districts have become more reluctant to encourage personnel to attend face-to-face trainings and are calling for a web-based approach. In the three years of implementation, the project has reduced the number of Regional Trainers by 1/3. Although they are reimbursed for their travel expenses; they are not paid hourly for their travel time. Due to the increase in region size, they are traveling greater distances.

Initially, the expected time allotted for this project was one year. The project is currently in its fourth year of implementation. Two years ago, the Technical Architect devised a plan to create Web Based Trainings (WBT) in order to facilitate usage by LEAs for support and for individuals who could not attend trainings. The team used Adobe (then Macromedia) Captivate to create Flash videos that simulated the language and structure of the CECAS Handbook. One Regional Trainer is in charge of the video development and her work is closely reviewed by the rest of the team. The team leaders have been very concerned that the videos closely follow the CECAS manual; so none of the instructional capabilities of Captivate (simulations, quizzes, etc.) have been utilized. The videos are purely informational, sequential instructional videos, providing no feedback to the learner and utilizing no instructional model.

The videos are hosted on the [CECAS Information site](#) in the Training Downloads section. Use of the materials has been extremely limited, with very few LEAs utilizing them for teacher or administrator training. Currently, their purpose is as an electronic performance support system. Usage has not been tracked, but reports from the Regional Trainers suggest LEAs are not utilizing the resource. This is an unfortunate situation because countless hours and resources have been spent on the development of the videos and districts have enthusiastically expressed an interest in some form of distance learning.

This project will focus on the development of the following three instructional modules:

1. Introduction to CECAS
2. Using Forms to Manage CECAS Student Data
3. Reporting and Analyzing Data Using CECAS

Other goals for this project are to upgrade and update any user interfaces that house module materials and develop a series of assessments to evaluate effectiveness of training program and materials.

PROJECT SCOPE

Problem Statement

The North Carolina CECAS Implementation Team (a.k.a. The EC Delivery Team) has created a series of multimedia training videos using Captivate that can be easily distributed via web or CD. This project will focus on the development of an instructional program that will include the development of multimedia training videos utilizing an instructional model for design, supporting documents detailing options for using the videos and strategies for creating awareness and documenting use of the modules that are accessed via the web. It is the goal of this project to develop a more flexible, consistent, efficient and convenient web-based training for all districts.

Information Gathering

Information regarding the project structure, goals, needs and budget has been gathered from the CECAS Training website, project documentation and through an interview with a member of the training team. This information includes the roles and responsibilities of key project players, although these have not been updated as titles have changed.

A. Project Structure

The CECAS implementation team was formed three years ago to design, develop and deliver training to LEA leaders. The project began with the following team members:

Project Manager
Administrative Assistant
Technical Architect
Functional Systems and Quality Assurance Analyst
Training Coordinator
EC Specialist (2)
Regional Trainer (5)

In three years, the project has seen three project managers and lost 3 trainers (only one was replaced). Trainers have seen an increase in their workload. Each trainer has gained one region (6 total regions in the state). The current project team is as follows:

EC Divisional CIO
Administrative Assistant
Technical Architect
Functional Systems Analyst
Quality Assurance Analyst
Training Coordinator
EC Specialist (2)
EC Technology Support Analyst (2)
Regional Trainer (3)

B. Training Goals

The CECAS Information Site provides a list of training goals and approaches (developed in 2004):

“CECAS rollout includes a comprehensive training program to get users statewide efficiently using the system as quickly as possible. Several approaches are being employed as part of the training program:

- Just-In-Time Training: The EC community will receive training on those portions of the application needed first - namely the tasks required to successfully meet the December 1, 2004 Child Count milestone.
- Blended Training: Various media will be utilized in the training program, including Web-Based Training Modules (WBTs) and instructor-led classroom sessions.
- Train-the-Trainer (TtT): The CECAS vendor and DPI CECAS Team will be training a series of trainers, who will be responsible for training additional users based on their level in the training plan. For example, regional CECAS trainers will train LEA CECAS Contacts, who will train EC personnel at the school level. “ (www.NCCECAS.org)

Interview data suggests that, although the “Just-In-Time” and “Train the Trainer” approaches have been utilized, the “Blended” approach has not been implemented. Although demonstrations are included in the face-to-face training, the web-based modules have never been incorporated into a presentation.

C. Perceived Needs (interviews):

In order to develop a list of perceived needs, interviews were conducted with the following key stakeholders:

- Regional Trainers
- Regional Program Consultant
- District Leaders

1. All stakeholders agreed that cost of face-to-face trainings on their end was extremely important. They felt that some type of distance option should be offered to districts who cannot afford to send personnel to face-to-face training.
2. The Regional Program Consultant suggested that districts have expressed a need for web-based trainings in a variety of areas other than CECAS. She suggested that the need for distance learning is increasing.
3. The Regional Trainer feels that the existing videos have not been utilized by districts because they: (1) cannot find them on the website; (2) have never been instructed on how to use them; (3) come with no instructions for their use; (4) have never been told that they may be used as a “blended approach,” “self-instructional module,” or as an electronic performance support system.
4. The trainings that are being offered to districts are the same trainings that were offered in the first year of implementation, with minor changes as the system has changed.
5. Districts are not offered a platform to discuss and share best practices for using the system in creative ways.
6. The focus of the project has not been on instructional development, but rather a very technical approach has been taken with training.
7. Technical milestones and upgrades are consistently prioritized above instructional assessment, design and development.
8. Training program has never been evaluated for effectiveness. Only trainers are evaluated for learner satisfaction.

D. Budget Analysis

Data Collected:

There is no published budget for the CECAS project on the website, although some salary information was published in the meeting minutes

of the North Carolina School Board Association. Other information was collected from the regional trainers. Currently, CECAS operates on an approximate \$2 million annual budget. This covers all resources, personnel, travel, etc. associated with the cost of the project. The maintenance, upgrades and other technical services are also paid out of this budget. Approximately \$750,000 is paid to personnel, with each trainer spending approximately \$13,000 - \$15,000 annually in travel expenses.

For two years, districts received CECAS implementation funding, but this is no longer budgeted. School districts must pay for personnel to manage the data, travel to trainings and meetings and the cost of their own meetings. District officials complained that these costs across all program areas quickly deplete their own local budget. Although they realize the value of sending personnel to trainings and meetings, they feel that this is an added expense when budgets are extremely tight and the cost of travel is rapidly rising.

This year, the system was moved from an outside vendor to a local server. Although this will eliminate the cost of outsourcing, the in-house maintenance of this server will be substantial. The cost of the migration was also paid out of the CECAS budget.

Brief Analysis:

Due to the high cost of personnel, travel expenses and maintaining the system, the CECAS budget does not include figures for expanding or improving the delivery of training. Currently, the amount spent on travel for each trainer is extraordinarily high and could be cut to compensate for the cost of this project. This project will have a projected budget of \$4,500 (non-personnel resources) - the amount allocated for travel for trainers for the expected duration (3 months) of the project. This does not include salaries and other expenses that will be taken into account when constructing the actual project budget.

E. Gap Analysis from Collected Data

Current Level of Performance	Optimal Level of Performance	Identified Performance Gap
Although training site lists a “Blended Training” as a training approach, no blended trainings have been designed or developed.	Blended Training approach is used to offer users a face-to-face, web-based demonstration approach to their trainings.	Design and development of “Blended Training” and “Self-Instructional Modules.”
Districts have never been officially granted permission to use videos as a “blended approach,” “self-instructional module,” or as an electronic performance support system.	Districts are free to utilize one of four (4) types of approaches for delivery of CECAS training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Face-to-Face ▪ Blended ▪ Just-In-Time (support) ▪ Self-Instructional 	Awareness must be increased regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of web-based modules ▪ Availability of supplemental materials ▪ Permission to use
Users are presented with standalone Flash videos without guidelines for using them.	Users are offered Flash videos with accompanying documentation that explains options for using them in the following environments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face-to-face trainings • Individual asynchronous trainings • Within a learning management system (LMS) as part of an online course. • Synchronous online training (individual or group instruction) 	Creation of guides to utilizing Web-based Trainings in a variety of settings.
Flash videos exist for download that mirror training manual.	Flash videos exist for download that simulate or enhance face-to-face training.	Redesign of Flash videos to include instructional design principals.

The trainings that are being offered to districts are the same trainings that were offered in the first year of implementation, with minor changes as the system has changed.	New trainings are constantly being developed. Trainings become less about how to use application and more about contextual application use.	Continual upgrades to trainings. New trainings offered each year. Old trainings offered less frequently. Encourage progression of content knowledge.
Existing videos are not easy to find on the training website.	Main page contains clear navigation and highlights training.	Site re-design offers windows to more site content on main page.
No option exists for districts to train at a distance.	Synchronous, asynchronous or hybrid training opportunities are offered to all districts.	Addition of instructional resources, modules, etc. to training site.
Districts are not offered a platform to discuss and share best practices for using the system in creative ways.	Discussion boards contain discussions about troubleshooting, training, utilizing, etc. CECAS	Creation of discussion boards.
The focus of the project has not been on instructional development, but rather a very technical approach has been taken with training.	Training materials are developed using researched instructional design models and utilize modern approaches.	Re-design of instructional materials.
Technical milestones and upgrades are consistently prioritized above instructional assessment, design and development.	Important training dates (i.e. conferences) are considered when developing technical timeline.	Increased communication, revision of project goals.
Training program has never been evaluated for effectiveness. Only trainers are evaluated for learner satisfaction.	Training program is known to be effective due to the increased use of CECAS optional functions.	Development of evaluation instrument.

PROJECT PLANNING

A. Deliverables

The goal of this project is to develop:

- Three (3) units of instruction (Introduction to CECAS, Using Forms in CECAS and Reporting and Analyzing Data Using CECAS) including the following materials:
 - Web-based instructional simulations and modules that conform to research-based instructional models;
 - Materials (lesson plans) that detail possible uses of Flash videos in a variety of settings including: face-to-face, blended or online instruction;
- An updated CECAS Information Page whose primary focus is on training information, updates, approaches and links to communities that allow users to collaborate on the most effective uses of the CECAS system in school systems of varying size;
- Assessment tools to ensure effectiveness of developed trainings as well as learning outcomes, participant satisfaction and training program effectiveness.

B. Benefits

The project deliverables will benefit North Carolina school districts by:

- Facilitating cost-effective training of district CECAS users;
- Offering a flexible, consistent, researched and structured training program utilizing web-based and print resources;
- Hosting a variety of training materials, approaches and user support documents on an easy-to-use website with an intuitive interface;
- Reducing the amount of travel required for district personnel seeking CECAS training or support in developing training for individual LEA's.
- Consistently improving training approaches by assessing learning outcomes, participant satisfaction and training program effectiveness.

Project Specifications

Constraints

Constraint	Explanation
Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time is a constraint this year due to a number of technical initiatives including major database changes, a migration from outsourced to local servers and the loss of a trainer position. There are two main dates that must be observed - December 1 and April 1. These dates and the weeks surrounding them are designated “Periodic Child Count dates.” Since the system is being used by districts, no interruption in the training schedule can occur.
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CECAS budget is designated for operational purposes only and is not expected to remain at the current level of funding. Personnel required for this project have already been hired and no additional positions will be created. Budget for this project will not be renewable in planning for subsequent years unless another need is identified.
Consistency of Training	The project team is extremely concerned that training be delivered consistently across the state. The design of the modules must clearly state objectives, learning activities and assessment items clearly so that they may be repeated in a variety of settings with multiple facilitators.
Simple and Accessible	The system that is developed must be simple, ADA compliant and include a job aid that instructs users on how to access the appropriate information.

Alternative Analysis

- *Alternative Solution 1: Replace missing regional trainers.*
 - A. Benefits
 - a. All regions would have localized support from assigned regional trainer.
 - b. A reduction in travel expenses for both regional trainers and school districts would result.
 - c. Regions/districts could develop trainings based on individual needs with the help of trainer due to an increased amount of individual support.

- B. Consequences
 - a. This solution would cost at least \$120,000.
 - b. Training consistency would not be guaranteed.
 - c. Districts would become isolated from each other in their use of CECAS, rather than collaborating on different ways to use the program.
- *Alternative Solution 2: Devote one trainer to online instruction.*
 - A. Benefits
 - a. Complete online training program could be designed, developed and implemented.
 - b. Districts could choose to have personnel trained using a secondary approach.
 - c. More online instructors could be trained and the state could train a larger number of people, taking strain off school districts.
 - d. Training consistency would be established.
 - B. Consequences
 - a. State would lose regional trainer, increasing load on other trainers, who are already overloaded having lost two trainers.
- *Alternative Solution 3: Update face-to-face training each year and offer more trainings.*
 - A. Benefits
 - a. Trainings would be appropriate, need-based and consistently up-to-date with relevant issues addressed.
 - b. Training could focus on use and integration instead of process of using CECAS.
 - B. Consequences
 - a. Would require more development from an already overloaded staff.
 - b. Support to the districts would decline due to increased development load on trainers.
 - C. *Alternative Solution 4: Purchase an online learning system (with synchronous and asynchronous capabilities).*
 - a. Benefits
 - Trainings could be designed and developed once, hosted on the system and taken by district personnel at any time.
 - Regional trainers could host trainings at any time from remote locations, reducing the amount of travel required.
 - b. Consequences
 - The cost of a system like this is extremely high, especially to service the entire state.

- There is no guarantee that district personnel will use this system.
- The project team will have to hire or assign someone to maintain the system.
- Training for project team on using the system would be extensive.
- Development of course materials would be costly.

D. Alternative Solution 5: Limit the number of entry-level trainings to each region yearly to limit amount of travel and increase development of more modules.

a. Benefits

- Trainers and districts could focus on integration of CECAS into daily activities instead of basic functionality.
- A variety of trainings could be developed by both project and district personnel.
- Trainings would be more need-based rather than constant content.

b. Consequences

- New district personnel would have a fewer number of opportunities.
- Training schedule would be inflexible.

Resource Needs

Project Team

Team Member	Project Duties	% Time	Cost
EC Divisional CIO (ECCIO)	Set project milestones and deadlines, supervise key team members, set budget	50%	\$0 (Included in Job Description)
Administrative Assistant (AA)	Correspondence between Divisional CIO and project team. Design, develop and distribute awareness materials to school districts. Assistance with planning meetings.	80%	\$0 (Included in Job Description)
Technical Architect (TA)	Participate in formative evaluation of instructional materials, initial planning.	10%	\$0 (Included in Job Description)
Functional Systems Analyst (FSA)	Participate in formative evaluation of instructional materials, initial planning.	10%	\$0 (Included in Job Description)
Quality Assurance Analyst (QA)	Participate in formative evaluation of all instructional materials. Syntax and grammatical errors, usability, and accessibility issues will be a primary focus.	50%	\$0 (Included in Job Description)
Training Coordinator (TC)	Coordinate, design and development of instructional materials; design and develop formative evaluation of all materials	80%	\$0 (Included in Job Description)
EC Specialists (2) (ECS 1&2)	Work with Regional Trainers to design and develop all curriculum materials for all modules;	80%	\$0 (Included in Job Description)
EC Technology Support Analyst (ESA)	Development, review and evaluation of materials.	80%	\$0 (Included in Job Description)

Regional Trainers (3) (RCT1,2,3)	Development of all instructional materials.	80%	\$0 (Included in Job Description)
---	---	-----	--------------------------------------

Explanation: All members of the project team are currently working with the project. The “%Time” column explains how much of their time will be spent working on this project for the duration of the project in addition to their other duties.

Non-personnel Resources

Resource Needed	Description	Number	Unit Cost	Total
Captivate 3 Upgrade	Multimedia Design Software	3	\$299	\$897.00
MS Office 2007 Pro Upgrade	Includes Publisher, Word and PowerPoint (needed software for project)	5	\$329	\$1645.00
Catering for Kick-off Meeting	Two (2) catered lunches for development team.	7*2	\$10	\$140.00
Adobe Connect	Synchronous meeting application.	10 users for 3 months	\$750 /mo.	\$2250.00
Total Non-personnel Resources				\$4,932.00

Explanation: In order to carry out such a large multimedia project, significant upgrades to critical project development team software must occur. This has not occurred in four years. Currently, team members are using Captivate 1 and MS Office 2000 for document creation. The newest versions of each are more appropriate for the development of web-based content.

Total Project Cost

Resource	Cost
Personnel Resources (All included in current contract)	\$0
Non-personnel Resources	\$4,932.00
Total	\$4,932.00

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Formative

- The Training Coordinator will develop the formative evaluation for each component of each module.
- Formative evaluation will occur as each component of each module has been built. In the past, the team has reviewed and evaluated each other's work with much success. This type of document review will continue to occur at each level of the project.
- In the past, a focus group of school district administrators has been utilized for both training development and delivery. This focus group will continue to be used as they are experts in teacher professional development and will critically evaluate each portion of the module.
- The Technical Architect, Functional Systems Analyst, and Quality Assurance Analyst will all participate in the formative evaluations in order to ensure quality products that will be capable of being displayed on the web.

Summative

- The training program will be evaluated on user satisfaction surveys, usage reports and trainer logs of user support.
- The training will be evaluated by observing the number of school systems who report using the materials in their district training.
- An assessment tool will also be given to a random sampling of school district officials to measure their perceived value of the training program.

RISK IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT

Risk: Critical Project

Definition	From time to time, critical projects arise and require immediate attention.	Risk Selection Matrix Attention		
Probability	Low	Impact (Low-High)		
Planned Response	Although the probability for this event is low, the impact could be somewhat significant. Because of this, significant time has been given to resources for development work.		x	
		Probability (Low-High)		

Risk: April 1st Head Count

Definition	April 1 Head Count is a critical time for all CECAS team members. The week before and of April 1 are especially busy with support calls for all Regional Trainers and Tech Support.	Risk Selection Matrix Attention		
Probability	High	Impact (Low-High)		
Planned Response	This time will be used in the schedule as “slack,” allowing for all phases of the project to catch up before the final stretch. A significant amount of time has been added to the beginning of April to account for this risk.			x
		Probability (Low-High)		
		High - Action Required		

Risk: System Failure

Definition	Since the CECAS database has been migrated recently to the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, there is a possibility the system could go down, creating a huge support issue as well as an issue in using the system for module development.	<u>Risk Selection Matrix</u> Attention		
Probability	Low	Impact (Low-High)	x	
Planned Response	Although the probability of this occurring is extremely low, the impact is so high that it must be taken into account. If this were to occur, the project would have to be redesigned with later end dates, depending on the amount of time lost.			
			Probability (Low-High)	High - Action Required

Communication Plan

The majority of the key CECAS Implementation team members are located at the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction in Raleigh, NC. This team already meets on a regular basis to discuss project progress and initiatives. The Regional Trainers, however, work remotely and do not attend the regular meetings. The trainers meet each week via conference call with the Training Coordinator. The Regional Trainers are also consistently connected via email and instant message daily. They have collaborated in the past using email, instant message and conference calls. This team will communicate similarly for this project.

The Regional Trainers have, however, requested more contact with the Project Manager and other team members for this project. A bi-weekly conference call will be scheduled for the entire team using Adobe Connect, a synchronous web-based communication tool that offers multimedia features that a telephone cannot. All daily communication will be via email and telephone.

Schedule Control Plan

Although risks have been identified and slack time has been included in the project management plan, unforeseen complications can always occur. Late start and late finish dates have been included in the project.

At each bi-weekly online meeting, the project schedule will be reviewed and analyzed. The Project Manager will review the previous two weeks, discuss the upcoming weeks and, after the meeting, distribute an updated schedule.

In the event that the project timeline falls behind by more than two weeks (the amount of slack built into the project), the project will be re-designed. The project re-design will add tasks to Regional Trainer 1 who, by design, carries less of the load in order to pick up tasks as needed.

PROJECT WORK

Work Breakdown Structure

1. Assess Needs to Identify Project Goals (completed prior to project)
2. Survey for District Personnel to Complete Regarding Current Training
3. Initial Project Kick-off Meeting to Discuss Front-End Analysis
 - 3.1 Inform Team Members of Roles
 - 3.2 Critically Review Existing Training
 - 3.3 Develop Instructional Goals for New Modules
4. Conduct Instructional Analysis
 - 4.1 Classify Goals using Domains of Learning
 - 4.2 Describe Ideal Performance
 - 4.3 Extract Existing Task Analysis from Current Web Modules (1, 2 and 3)"
5. Analyze Learners and Environment
6. Completion of Front End Analysis
7. Design and Develop Module 1 (Prototype)
 - 7.1 Write Performance Objectives for Module 1
 - 7.1.1 Development of Performance Objectives for Module 1
 - 7.1.2 Feedback for Performance Objectives
 - 7.1.3 Revision of Performance Objectives
 - 7.2 Develop Assessment Activities for Module 1
 - 7.2.1 Development of Assessment Activities for Module 1
 - 7.2.2 Feedback for Assessment Activities
 - 7.2.3 Revision of Assessment Activities
 - 7.3 Develop Instructional Strategies for Module 1
 - 7.3.1 Development of Instructional Strategies for Module 1
 - 7.3.2 Feedback for Instructional Strategies
 - 7.3.3 Revision of Instructional Strategies
 - 7.4 Develop Instructional Materials for Module 1
 - 7.4.1 Development of Instructional Materials for Module 1
 - 7.4.2 Feedback for Instructional Materials
 - 7.4.3 Revision of Instructional Materials
 - 7.5 Design and Conduct Formative Evaluation for Module 1
 - 7.5.1 Design Formative Evaluation
 - 7.5.2 Conduct Formative Evaluation
 - 7.5.3 Analyze Formative Evaluation Results
 - 7.5.4 Report Findings of Formative Evaluation
 - 7.6 Revise Instructional Module
8. Completion of Module 1 (Prototype)
9. Design and Develop Awareness Materials
 - 9.1 Announce Upcoming Training Materials on CECAS Website

- 9.2 Construct Email for NCDPI Contacts (Technology, Instructional Technology, EC)"
- 9.3 Construct Announcement and Contact State Webmaster to Request an Announcement be Added to Home Page
- 9.4 Construct Email for District Contacts
- 10. Distribute Awareness Materials
- 11. Development of Modules and 3
 - 11.1 Write Performance Objectives for Modules 2 and 3
 - 11.1.1 Development of Performance Objectives Module 2
 - 11.1.2 Feedback for Performance Objectives Module 2
 - 11.1.3 Revision of Performance Objectives Module 2
 - 11.1.4 Development of Performance Objectives Module 3
 - 11.1.5 Feedback for Performance Objectives Module 3
 - 11.1.6 Revision of Performance Objectives Module 3
 - 11.2 Develop Assessment Activities for Modules 2 and 3
 - 11.2.1 Activity Development Module 2
 - 11.2.2 Feedback Module 2
 - 11.2.3 Revision Module 2
 - 11.2.4 Activity Development Module 3
 - 11.2.5 Feedback Module 3
 - 11.2.6 Revision Module 3
 - 11.3 Develop Instructional Strategies for Modules 2 and 3
 - 11.3.1 Strategy Development Module 2
 - 11.3.2 Feedback Module 2
 - 11.3.3 Revision Module 2
 - 11.3.4 Strategy Development Module 3
 - 11.3.5 Feedback Module 3
 - 11.3.6 Revision Module 3
 - 11.4 Develop and Select Instructional Materials for Modules 2 and 3
 - 11.4.1 Materials Development Module 2
 - 11.4.2 Feedback Module 2
 - 11.4.3 Revision Module 2
 - 11.4.4 Materials Development Module 3
 - 11.4.5 Feedback Module 3
 - 11.4.6 Revision Module 3
- 12. Completion of Modules 2 and 3 Drafts
- 13. Design and Conduct Formative Evaluation for Modules 2 and 3
 - 13.1 Formative Evaluation Design
 - 13.2 Formative Evaluation Development
 - 13.3 Feedback
 - 13.4 Revision
- 14. Conduct Formative Evaluation of Modules 2 and 3
- 15. Revision of Modules 2 and 3
- 16. Revise Web Page to Include New Material
- 17. Launch Revised Web with New Modules
- 18. Web-based Training Modules Live

- 19. Summative Evaluation for All Modules
 - 19.1 Design Summative Evaluation
 - 19.2 Select Uninvolved Party to Conduct Summative Evaluation
 - 19.3 Perform Summative Evaluation of Training Program
- 20. Review Summative Evaluation Report

Milestones

Milestone	Estimated Completion Date
Completion of Front End Analysis	February 20, 2008
Completion of Module 1 (Prototype)	April 9, 2008
Completion of Modules 2 and 3 Drafts	April 25, 2008
Distribute Awareness Materials	May 2, 2008
Web-based Training Modules Live	May 9, 2008
Review Summative Evaluation Report	October 6, 2008

[Microsoft Project Planning Document](#)

[PDF of Microsoft Project Planning Document](#)