

EVALUATION REPORT FOR WPD 2.0.3 LALA FRAMEWORK

Deliverable of the project: LALA -- Building Capacity to
Use Learning Analytics to Improve Higher Education
in Latin America

March 2019

Abelardo Pardo
Contact: Abelardo.pardo@unisa.edu.au



Executive Summary

The project LALA -- Building Capacity to Use Learning Analytics to Improve Higher Education has submitted for evaluation two of its deliverables: the LALA framework, and the dissemination plan. The objective of the project is to improve the overall quality, relevance and efficiency of higher education institutions in Latin America. The area selected to achieve this objective is the adoption of processes and methods in the area of learning analytics. The deliverables evaluated in this document are essential parts used towards achieving the objective.

The LALA framework presents a set of phases and activities specifically designed to provide institutions with a process to first analyse their own structure, resources, and units and then based on that assessment, articulate a strategic plan for adoption of learning analytics. The framework is divided into “dimensions” or “manual” with very specific activities and resources as well as detailed deployment guides. The document provides the rationale to adopt this approach and the need to provide such support in Latin America despite the instruments and initiatives that have occurred in the past in other areas.

The overall structure of the framework although solid, could benefit from several suggestions in terms of identification of stakeholders, refinement of the terminology and overall cohesiveness. The task to design such framework is not trivial and this deliverable has definitively made a substantial contribution in this direction. As with any other elements similar to this one, one of the crucial aspects is its contextualization. Institutions need to identify relevant elements of the framework and translate them into their own internal entities.

The deliverable also hints at how the framework will evolve over time. The creation of a community of practice with a clear set of dissemination actions will undoubtedly help institutional members to share their journey and to create a context of productive collective intelligence. The combination of the framework with the community of practice have defined a very promising structure that now needs to evolve and refine.

The dissemination plan contains a comprehensive set of activities and events to promote the exchange of know-how in at various levels. The plan can be further refined through the provision of more precise impact measures in the areas of systemic change inside and outside of the project consortium, and with relation to the number of students that have been either directly or indirectly affected by actions that emanated from the project.

All in all, the evaluation acknowledges the potential for this project to create a significant impact on how educational institutions in Latin America approach the use of learning analytics.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Table of Contents.....	2
1 Introduction	4
1.1 Objectives.....	4
1.2 Methodology and Structure.....	5
2 Overall comments of the deliverables.....	5
2.1 LALA Framework	5
2.2 Terminology	8
2.3 Stakeholders	9
2.4 Dissemination Plan.....	10
3 LALA Framework Overview (Section 3).....	10
3.1 Main Elements of the Section	10
3.2 Suggestions	10
4 Institutional Dimension Manual (Section 4)	12
4.1 Main Elements of the Section	12
4.2 Suggestions	12
5 Technological Dimension Manual (Section 5)	16
5.1 Main Elements of the Section	16
5.2 Suggestions	16
6 Ethical Dimension Manual (Section 6).....	20
6.1 Main Elements of the Section	20
6.2 Suggestions	21
7 Community Dimension Manual (Section 7).....	22
7.1 Main Elements of the Section	22
7.2 Suggestions	22
8 Preliminary Data Application LALA Framework (Section 8).....	24
8.1 Main Elements of the Section	24

8.2 Suggestions24

9 Dissemination Plan.....25

9.1 Main Elements of the Plan.....25

9.2 Suggestions25

10 Conclusions27

11 Appendix – Additional Comments28

11.1 General Comments28

11.2 Specific Comments about the LALA Framework document28

11.3 Specific Comments about the LALA Dissemination Plan30

Bibliography31

1 Introduction

The purpose of this document is to evaluate the deliverable WPD2.0.3 LALA Framework (Version 1.1) and the dissemination activities that are part of the project “LALA: Building Capacity to User Learning Analytics to Improve Higher Education in Latin America”. The project is situated in the context of the deployment of learning analytics (henceforth simply LA) techniques in higher educational institutions in Latin America. As stated in the project description, the level of institutional adoption of these processes has been steady in other parts of the world such as Europe, USA and Australia. However, as pointed out by the project documentation, uptake of these processes in Latin America requires building institutional capacity so that learning analytics initiatives are considered at the right levels of the leadership teams, properly resourced, and designed and deployed taking into consideration the right elements.

In deliverable WPD2.0.3 the LALA framework is described. The project presents the structure of the framework divided into so-called manuals. The objective of the framework is to provide guidelines to support institutional adoption of learning analytics processes. As with any framework tackling this problem there are numerous aspects that need to be considered. Frameworks like the one described in the deliverable can potentially be used in a large number of contexts. Therefore, a substantial part of their structure is to scope and obtain detailed information about that context and understand how it affects the ultimate goal (the deployment of effective data-driven learning analytic initiatives). Another aspect to take into account is the difficulty to define a framework like this one in its first attempt. The deep expertise of the project partners provides an ideal context to design the framework, but it is equally important to consider the framework as a dynamic object that needs to be deployed, evaluated, and ultimately refined. The evaluation described in this document has been elaborated under this premise. The framework is its initial stages in development (version 1.1), and its use and adoption by several educational institutions in Latin America will provide very valuable information shaping its future versions.

1.1 Objectives

The objective of this review is twofold. The first one is to summarise the structure of the framework and the relationship among its elements (manuals, methodology, stakeholders, etc.) The second one is to enunciate several avenues to explore, feedback to consider, and additional elements to ponder. These two objectives aim at providing an external point of view of the design, deployment and dissemination activities within the project and offer elements and comments that may contribute to its enhancement.

1.2 Methodology and Structure

The methodology used for this review was based on a detailed exploration of the main elements described in the framework to identify the justifications provided by the authors for the presence of these elements. In addition, the method also included a stage to identify the elements and terminology that are used consistently throughout the and verify its consistency. The method assumed the existence of a hypothetical educational institution that is outside of the project consortium and wants to engage in the area of learning analytics and identify what are the steps required for such adoption.

The information in the remaining of the document starts with a section containing overall comments about the deliverables followed by sections that refer to specific parts of the report (WPD2.0.3) except Section 9 that refers to the dissemination activities in the context of the project. Each section starts with a sub-section describing the main elements of the corresponding part of the report followed by a sub-section providing suggestions. Section 10 provides a succinct set of conclusions about the report and Section 11 Is an appendix with suggestions about changes in specific locations of the document.

2 Overall comments of the deliverables

2.1 LALA Framework

Section 1 (Introduction) of the report provides the context in which the framework is proposed as well as the description of the factors that justify its presence. The main premise is that there is evidence documenting how some higher education institutions have started to embrace learning analytics at a process and policy level in areas ranging from data capture to the deployment of processes in their regular teaching and learning operations. The report then rightly points out to the scarce number of initiatives in which institutional adoption has been described, or even achieved at a comprehensive level and the need for further initiatives.

The crucial observation that underpins the description of the framework (and to some extent the entire project) is that the institutional adoption of LA processes in Latin America is highly fragmented and localized into isolated contexts. The authors then claim the need for a community that promotes the exchange of ideas, methodologies, tools and results within the region. But creating a community by itself does not address the problem directly. More specific instruments are needed, and the LALA framework is one of them. The creation of this framework has been influenced heavily by additional projects with a significant overlap of the research teams. The report provides a comprehensive set of

references and institutions in which models and policies in the area of learning analytics have been used. The introduction of this document could elaborate a bit further to clarify why all those resources, although available, still need to be complemented by the contribution of this project (for example, the framework). There is plenty of evidence throughout the report about the need to approach the problem under the lens of the Latin American context, however, a potential reader of the framework needs to know why simply reusing information from the projects mentioned in the document does not address the current context.

The introduction of the framework could benefit from a clearer separation between the advance of research initiatives, and the context of institutional adoption. The context of the framework is rightly set in terms of institutional adoption, and the rest of the framework is clearly set in this area. However, when describing the fundamental dimensions of the framework, the fourth one refers to the articulation of the community to access support for research and development. This access to support is not clearly articulated in the framework that has its emphasis on how institutions identify and implement their initiatives for adoption.

The introduction also provides a very detailed description of previous models of institutional adoption that have been published in the research literature. These models are structures to understand how institutions react, but they are significantly different from the framework described in the document. This distinction should be clarified further in the introduction. A reader interested in the framework needs to have a clear distinction between the models proposed so far to understand how institutions react or adapt to this context, from the framework or guidelines provided by the project.

An additional aspect that needs further clarification in the introduction of the framework is the distinction between the adoption or incorporation of processes, and tools. The framework will probably increase its versatility if articulated around the notion of process. There is a clear connection between processes and tools, but when reasoning in terms of processes, those that do not require specific tools will also be easily translated into the framework. In other words, the suggestion would be to review the focus of the framework to be less *tool centric*. In a vein close to the previous suggestion, the framework could include a more detailed set of steps to articulate policies, sensitivity about this within leadership teams, and the required capacity building in personnel. These three aspects have been shown to have a significant impact when other institutions have decided to embrace learning analytics processes.

As defined, the framework clearly identified the need to address aspects such as methodology, technological requirements and ethics. Potential adopters of the framework could benefit from a more detailed classification of these aspects to complement the

description of the four manuals. In other words, after the framework is consolidated, a hypothetical final stage could be envisioned that produces a taxonomy or classification of the issues addressed and connects them with the various phases in the manuals.

When describing the purpose of the framework, there are several instances in the document referring to the provision of guidance for the design, implementation and use of learning analytics tools. In numerous other locations in the document, the purpose is framed under the more generic terms of promoting “institutional adoption”. In other parts of the report the objective is framed as the development of a culture of learning analytics in higher education. Although these aims and objectives are all heavily connected, the document should provide a more precise relation between these objectives. The statements referring to the promotion of institutional adoption are more generic than those in terms of design, implementation and use of tools. It could be again a manifestation of the *tool centric* approach previously mentioned. Although the elements of the framework clearly contain certain aspects that are specific for the tool deployment, the overarching philosophy is to foster institutional adoption.

The framework presents an intuitive structure articulated around four dimensions: institutional, technical, ethical, and community. After reviewing the elements included in these dimensions in detail, there are two suggestions at this level. The first one refers to the institutional dimension. Assuming that the purpose of the framework is to foster institutional adoption of learning analytics, this first dimension defined in terms of the institution may appear too broad. In other words, the first dimension of a framework for the institutional adoption perhaps should not be denoted as institutional. Upon a more detailed review of its content, though, the elements clearly point to how institutions review their structure and strategy. Perhaps this new term for this first dimension captures more precisely what is included in its corresponding manual. There is certainly a complete alignment between this term and the proposed phases and activities.

The second suggestion at the level of the structure of the framework (that is, its dimensions) refers to its fourth component, the community dimension. It is clear all throughout the document that this is an essential part and it is clearly justified. However, the position of this element seems to be placed as a consequence of the framework, or as a step that is to be followed after the other manuals in the framework has been adopted. For example, the figure used in the document to illustrate the manuals and their relationship depicts the community dimension as the fourth step only connected to the third. Any potential member of this community would greatly benefit from joining the community at the early stages of their adoption journey. In other words, the framework could depict this community not necessarily as a Manual, or a Phase, but as an overarching entity that fosters all the activities in the other aspects. It is highly possible that institutions

with the intention of exploring how to embrace learning analytics in their process would start simply by joining the community and establish some initial contacts to information about the area and the next steps (which could perfectly be the use of the framework).

The central elements of the framework are the so-called “Manuals”. A manual implicitly conveys the notion of providing instructions. However, the material inside these manuals is a combination of activities, suggestions, reflections, etc. Additionally, the framework is clearly structure into “dimensions”. Perhaps the concept of manual can be reassessed for redundancy given the fact that each dimension corresponds with one manual. An potentially simpler structure could preserve the dimensions and simply state that each dimension contains a set of phases. The essence of the framework would be preserved, but the number of entities reduced.

To increase uptake by potential stakeholders, the document could benefit greatly from a more cohesive presentation of the structure across each of the sections. For example, sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 describe how to analyse the results of the activity in a subsection, whereas in section 4.4.3 this information is mixed with the rest of the description. The reader and potential adopter of this framework would benefit greatly if the structure is maintained consistently throughout the manuals. Along this same angle, the name of some of the names used in the structure could be simplified given that are part of the framework. For example, the sections explaining the methodology to create the manual could be simply renamed *Methodology*. The inclusion of the question that is being answered by each manual helps significantly the reader to quickly identify the purpose of the manual. It would be idea to have these framed in terms of competencies acquired by the reader as done for the ethical dimension (page 36).

The document includes a section on the community dimension. However, the section focuses on the articulation of the community. The project could consider including a section, perhaps in the introduction about how to disseminate the elements of this framework (or even the deliverable itself) so that it reaches the largest number of potential stakeholders.

2.2 Terminology

The document is very rich in terminology and consequently, its vocabulary needs to resort to numerous terms to identify the numerous elements of the framework. However, upon a more detailed read, and adopting the lens of an educational institutional member that is willing to embrace the framework, there could be some adjustments to consider in the terminology. More precisely, the framework includes the following relevant terms: dimension, manual, phase, activity, results, methodology and objectives. It would be a useful exercise to review this vocabulary considering the following observations:

- Each dimension has a single manual. The term dimension clearly identifies a set of factors that are tightly integrated. The presence of a manual in the dimension provides the sense of a sequence of steps. Perhaps the two terms can merge or explain explicitly that each dimension has a manual focusing on how to deliver activities.
- Each dimension or manual has several phases and, potentially, each phase has a set of activities. This is perhaps the element of this hierarchy that is less clear. Are there phases that have more than one activity? If so, is it worth introducing this extra level of hierarchy? Perhaps for the sake of simplicity the structure inside a dimension, or inside the manual in the dimension (see previous comment) could simply have phases, or activities.
- The description of the activities is done in terms of a set of elements, which is very useful to understand how to deploy them. However, these elements could be made more explicit. For example, use the term *Resources* for the instruments or scientific literature required for an activity. Use *Workplan* for the steps included in the activity and use *Evaluation* for the steps in which the results are analysed. These elements are already part of the framework and provide a very structured description at the level of activity, the suggestion is simply to use a more explicit labelling.

2.3 Stakeholders

The document contains numerous references to the stakeholders and their role in the various dimensions and phases. This element is used in several elements of the framework to frame the discussion, guide the selection of subjects for interviews, even classify the actions derived from the strategy. For this reason, it is recommendable to identify a rich set of stakeholder categories at the start of the document and use them all throughout the description of the framework.

This set of stakeholders should be as varied as possible to increase the uptake of the model. Potential users will probably start by identifying their institution with the elements proposed in the framework. This process will be simplified if the potential adopters identify their current roles with the proposed stakeholders. There is a risk of fragmenting too much this classification, however, during the initial steps to use the framework it is much less demanding from a partner to merge or ignore roles in the framework than finding no point of reference for some of their existing profiles.

2.4 Dissemination Plan

The dissemination plan contains a wide variety of initiatives aiming at combining scope and medium. The main vehicle to articulate the plan is the proposed LALA community that is also described in detail as part of the LALA Framework deliverable. This community will reflect the activities in other contexts such as regional, national and international presence, conference participation and presentations, presence in social media, and the creation of audio/visual material such as videos.

The variety of events is designed to engage institutions and practitioners at various levels to maximise the impact of the project. Some preliminary activities have been included in the plan. They provide an initial glimpse of the trajectory for the rest of the project.

3 LALA Framework Overview (Section 3)

3.1 Main Elements of the Section

This section in the deliverable contains crucial information to promote the uptake of the framework among educational institutions. The first element is a more in-depth description of the dimensions. As suggested in Section 2.1, the spirit of the institutional dimension is framed in terms of gaining awareness of the structure of the organisation and the strategic direction to follow. The context for the second dimension is expanded in terms of the aspects of adoption that are considered. The third dimension is clearly framed around issues related to ethical use of the data, privacy and security. The fourth dimension describes what is provided in terms of guidelines to join the community.

3.2 Suggestions

As briefly mentioned in Section 2.1, the aim of the framework is to promote the uptake of learning analytics in institutional processes. Very appropriately, the framework states as the first dimension an exploration of the current structure and the identification of strategic directions. For this reason, it is suggested to guide the reader and potential adopter of this framework in those terms for this first dimension. In other words, the stakeholders considering exploring institutional adoption of LA would perceive a more specific goal for the first dimension if framed in terms of scoping the institutional context (structure) and planning directions (strategy). Although the term “Institutional dimension” is clearly within the scope of this element, it could be argued that all elements in the framework refer to the institution.

A special mention is required for the last dimension. Even though it is an intrinsic and essential part of the framework, it could be framed as an entity that surrounds the framework, or even the context in which this framework can be developed to its full potential. If this is the spirit of such community, perhaps the formulation in these terms at the beginning of the document would provide potential adopters with a more compelling case.

Section 3.3 in the document provides a description of how to use the framework. The information this section however remains only at the descriptive level. Figure 1 provides a useful representation of the framework (which is then re-used when describing the dimensions) but the reader would benefit greatly from the description of the structure of the dimensions in terms of phases, activities, etc. This structure becomes clear when reading the rest of the sections, however, the reader would benefit enormously if this description is included in Section 3.3 as it is required to use the framework.

The description of each of the “phases” is very useful, but it could benefit from the review of the terminology suggested in Section 2.2 specially around dimensions, phases and activities.

The description of the first “phase” in this section (3.3) does not provide any additional information with respect to the previous description. It does confirm though the need to explore the current structure of the institution and the identification of the strategic steps. At this point in the document the reader could benefit greatly if a few sentences are included on how to use the phase, a very brief description of the activities included and the data that is captured. It is also at this point in the document where the framework could include as part of the structural exploration the need to identify capacity building in professional skills within the institution. This aspect is mentioned in other elements of the framework but perhaps requires an explicit mention in phase 1. Deficiencies in this aspect would definitively have an effect on the strategic directions resulting from this phase.

The iterative nature of phases 1 and 2 is a very important element of the framework. Assessing the state of the institution, assessing its strategic directions, and reviewing the deployment of processes is something that requires continuous refinement. Given its relevance perhaps the illustration of the framework through the image in Figure 1 could represent this property. As it stands right now it seems to imply that phase 1 must proceed phase 2, and then proceed to phase 3. A simple change in this figure would convey the need to consider this process as an iteration.

The descriptions of phase 4 is different from the rest. It includes data about its current constituency instead of instructions or suggestions about how to use the manual. The consortium should consider rephrasing this part of the document to provide information

about how to use that manual, that is, how to consider the community and take the first steps to explore its structure and benefits.

4 Institutional Dimension Manual (Section 4)

4.1 Main Elements of the Section

This section in the deliverable delves into the details of the institutional dimension manual, activities and result analysis. The use of the common figure showing the phase that is being analysed helps the reader to situate this part of the document. Five objectives are identified in this phase and they establish an explicit connection with other elements of the framework (especially the ethical dimension) and the need to create a strategy for adoption of learning analytics.

The manual is divided into four phases, and each of them contains a single activity. The overview section contains a very useful description of the phases, the instruments that are used in each phase, the aspects analysed, the type of instrument and the expected result. This table offers a truly valuable overview of the process inside the dimension. Analogously, Section 4.3 in the document provides a very detailed view of the methodology used to design this dimension (or manual). The document contains a very detailed description of the structure of the SHEILA project as its framework has influenced the design of the LALA framework.

Section 4.4 explains how the manual in this dimension is applied. For each phase there is a detailed description of the objective, the resources, the delivery of the activity and the analysis of the results. The potential audience for this document will find very detailed information about how to use the instruments and deploy the activities, which will likely translate into higher rates of adoption of the overall framework. The document also contains very detailed information about the surveys used and how to grade the responses.

4.2 Suggestions

This section is the first in which the word “stakeholder” is used. It is presented as a synonym to “actor” when in fact the two represent different figures. An actor is understood as someone that interacts with a given system, whereas a stakeholder has some interest in the system but does not necessarily interact with it. The suggestion is to include in the deliverable a more formal definition of stakeholders and their presence or connection with the various elements of the framework. It would be very beneficial to both readers and adopters of the framework to enumerate the stakeholders, differentiate them and, more importantly, connect them to the manuals, phases and activities in the framework.

The objectives stated in this dimension of the framework (specially the second one) is stated in terms of design and implementation of tools. This alignment can be made more generic if framed in terms of processes instead of tools. Institutions may have a need to re-evaluate processes when considering the adoption of learning analytics methods. For example, the visibility of data related to a course experience can be made available to instructors. This may not require any additional tool but a change in the processes responsible for this aspect. Framing the objectives in terms of processes also brings the objective of this dimension more in line with the creation of a strategic plan for the institution. Furthermore, the presence of new tools, or even the design and implementation of new tools can also be stated under the process frame.

The level of detail provided in the five objectives in this dimension are stated in very different levels of detail. For example, the fourth objective mixes the definition of a strategy (which is a high-level objective) with the action of promoting the use of analytical tools by students and teachers (low level action). The description of the objectives in a similar level of abstraction will help adopters to focus on the right aspects when using the manual. One potential refinement for these objectives could be to divide the strategic initiatives into areas (data management, technology implementation, etc) or perhaps connect them with the stakeholders.

The overview of the manual provides a very detailed description of the SHEILA project that perhaps could be reconsidered. Although there is undoubtedly a significant contribution from the project to the LALA framework, readers and adopters may not need such a level of detail about what that project did. Instead, it would be good to detail the reasons why it was needed to adapt some of the aspects of this project to the Latin American context as stated in the document. This would provide significant value to this manual. The authors could elaborate on what makes the context different and explore aspects such as for example hiring policies for academics or support personnel, approaches to student support, flexibility of the institutional units, etc. Although these differences will not be substantiated in strong evidence, the project consortium sure has the expertise to identify and describe them in the document. Perhaps this discussion can be included in the overall description of the framework as part of its justification. This detailed information would add much more value than the internals of the SHEILA project that are not used or reference in the other dimensions.

The introduction of the ROMA approach may need a more explicit connection with the methodology used in the framework. The references to publications related to ROMA provide a good context but they could be complemented with a pragmatic summary of what the approach is and why it is related to the framework. Perhaps the structure to include both the description of ROMA and the relation with SHEILA can be reframed as a

brief description of the first, a connection with the SHEILA project, and then articulating the relationship between the three axes and six dimensions of SHEILA and the four phases being described of the institutional manual.

Phase 1 of the manual presents the instrument and dimensions to analyse the state of the institutions. This is clearly a crucial initial step to apply the framework. However, the result stated in Table 1 presents it as simply a document identifying actors. Given that the dimensions analysed contain aspects such as potential changes in strategy, political context, or measurement and evaluation plan, there is a gap between the complexity of these dimensions and the simplicity of the result (actor identification).

Phase 3 of this manual consists on identifying what is expected from the use of educational data. The instrument proposed for this phase is a questionnaire that is offered to students and professors. There is a gap between the Phase 2 and Phase 3 because institutional leaders may have a say on what they expect in this area. In fact, the view of the institutional leaders may end up shaping the strategy of adoption. There needs to be an explicit consultation of this aspect from leaders. In the current formulation leaders are asked about the current diagnosis and the political context. Perhaps the aspect named “institutional needs” can be extended to include the expectations when using data.

The description of the first dimension adapted from the ROMA framework could be enhanced by providing a list of actors for which the behaviours need to be analysed. This could leave this dimension open to interpretation instead to be restricted to the provided examples (improvements in student performance, professors, professionals, etc)

The second dimension points to a critical aspect discussed previously: generation of new internal abilities. This refers to processes to build capacity within the institution to have the right expertise to support new processes. This element could be highlighted as a main element in the overall description of the manual.

The discussion of the application of the LALA CANVAS requires a high-level summary of its elements (even though there is a reference to an appendix). The reader could benefit greatly from a high-level vision of this instrument, its elements, and its purpose. In this way, references to the “Canvas quadrant” will be better contextualised. This activity also requires a set of subjects that needs to be carefully selected. Given that this section is about the delivery of this activity, it could contain a more in-depth description of alternatives when selecting potential participants. These selection guidelines should then be connected to the set of actors or stakeholders described when introducing the framework.

Activities such as the use of the LALA Canvas are not trivial and require carefully planned delivery. In order to facilitate the adoption of these activities, it would be good if the document includes a brief description of the data that is expected to be collected with the

instrument. This is the type of information that an institution may require to get a sense of the objectives.

Phase 2 of this manual describes a very important step in which stakeholders are asked about their vision or desires. It would help the users of this framework to include some ideas or leads for institutions that are not fully aware of the possibilities brought by LA processes. The text included in parenthesis provides an account that would be produced by someone with expertise in the field. These suggestions can be framed in terms of specific actions or changes that should occur in the institution and then establish the required steps to get to those actions. The description provided to analyse the results of the interviews suggest a coding scheme with a pre-defined set of categories. The document should clarify if these categories are suggested, mandated, or if they are open to contextualisation.

The description of Phase 3 (Section 4.4.3) is framed around the expectations on the use of data by students and academics. However, the information provided seems to be highly biased towards ethical and privacy issues. Are these the only ones that need to be considered? Other aspects such as the provision of valuable information, call to action, suggestions, etc could also be brought into the discussion. This is especially needed when discussing certain privacy aspects as the value of a service needs to be taken into account when analysing the level of privacy surrounded its delivery. It is unclear from the description provided in the text if the focus of these expectations is only on ethical aspects, or any aspect of the use of LA in general. In the table describing the phase (immediately after the section heading) the instruments are described as “Format of” whereas in previous activities they are described as surveys or questionnaires. This definition should be adjusted accordingly to be coherent with those in the rest of the document. Finally, in this phase, the procedure used to analyse the results needs to include an explanation about the reasons for the chosen order (highest percentage, the difference between normative and predictive answers).

The description of Phase 4 (section 4.4.4 in the deliverable) refers to a template document that is included in Appendix A1.8. This number is incorrect and should be perhaps A1.5. Still, in the appendix there is no document with this number. Page 83 seems to include the right document, but it has the incorrect heading. These errors make it difficult to navigate through the structure of this phase. The name of the instrument used in this phase is “LALA Template”. This name is very generic and could apply to several other documents considered in the framework. The potential adopters of the framework would benefit from a more precise title as to simplify the management of these documents. The description of this activity has a level of detail and clarification that is less than the previous ones. It uses the same six dimensions than the canvas, but its purpose is different as it is expected to include the strategy to achieve larger institutional uptake of LA processes. The objective of

the template needs to be expanded and made more specific connections with the other phases in this dimension. The vocabulary in terms of stakeholders and actors should also be consistent with the rest of the document. For example, the guidelines refer to “key people” as the ones that have to complete the template. This term needs to be refined and put in the context of the pre-defined stakeholders and actors. The section describing the data analysis for the “LALA Template” refers to a set of rating and sorting criteria. These criteria refer to levels of agreement which assumes a type of numeric response. However, assuming that the document that this phase is referring to is included on page 83 of the deliverable, none of the answers in that document are numeric. These inconsistencies need to be addressed in order for the adopters to understand and deploy this phase.

5 Technological Dimension Manual (Section 5)

5.1 Main Elements of the Section

This dimension presents three phases or activities to identify the steps that institutions need to adopt to tackle the problems derived from the design, implementation and evaluation of tools. In the description of the objectives the text is slightly modified to consider not only the design, but also the adaptation of existing tool. This reference is the first time it appears in the document.

The description of the manual correctly states the interdependency with the previous manual (institutional dimension). The objectives are framed in terms of three competencies that will be acquired within the institution.

The methodology to create this manual has also been obtained from existing literature (OrLA framework) that has been proposed by researchers in the area. The detailed description of the phases is followed by a section focusing on the delivery of the suggested activities. The sections provide detailed steps and precise information about the groups that need to be consulted at each stage. In this section there is a more precise definition and consideration for “managers” as a stakeholder group. Similar comment can be made for the stakeholder groups “developers” and “researchers”.

5.2 Suggestions

The first paragraphs of this section could include some of the information about the context and differences between this manual and the one part of the institutional dimension. This dimension contains a substantial number of new elements such as the notion of requirements, the inclusion of developers, managers and researchers. The document could include a more precise definition of the context that is assumed to deploy the activities.

The references included in this section need a substantial review as they are not included in the Bibliography found at the end of the document (for example, the references to Jivet et al, 2017; and Jivet et al 2018; Bodily and Verbert, 2017). The manual has clearly been influenced by these research contributions and the readers and adopters of the framework may want to follow these references to gather additional information and improve the adoption of the framework.

As mentioned in Section 2, it may benefit the overall framing of the problem in this dimension when stated in terms of tools and processes, not only around tools. There could be institutions in which tools are already available, but they require to change their processes so that analytics can be used in various mainstream service areas. By framing the technological aspects into this wider space, it offers this manual a potentially larger audience. The description of the objectives slightly addresses this issue by including the possibility of adapting tools. However, there could be a substantial need to consider processes as part of the technological adoption.

The objective described in the second paragraph of the introduction section and the objective included on section 5.1 are redundant and slightly contradictory. The first instance refers to the production of a set of technical requirements, whereas in the second it is expanded as a set of guidelines for the design, implementation and evaluation of learning analytics tools. This second aim is significantly wider than those in the other Manuals, and in fact aligns with one of the two objectives of the project.

When describing the objectives of this manual, the terms “technical requirements” and “guidelines” are mentioned in various locations. There needs to be a clearer text explaining that the manual will provide both elements, and they are obtained explicitly in some of the activities. It would also be very beneficial to clarify the distinction between what is obtained as a result of this manual and some additional information. In principle the manual helps institutions to obtain a list of requirements (for tools and processes) and guidelines for design and testing. The steps to follow to develop the required tools are part of another activity in the project and therefore should be clearly stated.

For the sake of completeness could consider the scenario in which an educational institution does not design or implement any of the tools identified in this manual but finds and decides to purchase a commercial product. There is a brief mention about this at the end of section 5.2 but the framing of the activities would be modified to include such situation and proceed to implementation only if needed using the guidelines that will be part of the next deliverable of the project.

As in the case of the previous manual, this one includes a set of phases, each of them has a single activity, and therefore, this layer could be removed. Various instruments are

proposed to implement these phases. In fact, Table 2 on page 27 does not refer any more to phases, but to activities. A more cohesive vocabulary should be adopted and propagated throughout the entire document. Heading 5.3.1 (incorrect) on page 28 refers to Phase, whereas 5.3.3 (incorrect) on page 33 refers to Activity)

Figure 4 in this section (and their analogous in the sections describing the other manuals) provide a very efficient and succinct description of the phases. The content inside each phase could be refined to adopt a coherent view. In other words, each line could be an activity, or perhaps distinguish between an activity (“Apply the guide...”) and its result (“Analysis of requirements obtained”). This would provide the reader a very good overview of the structure of the manual.

The use of the OrLA framework in this manual is done with two main modifications: the change of focus from adoption to design of requirements, and the introduction of a new role (the manager). Both steps need to be discussed in more detail specially the inclusion of the new role. A manager in an institution may have a wide variety of areas of impact. For example, there could be a manager making decisions about what is adequate or not with respect to the development of tools, but this manager could be in the area of data management infrastructure. The methodology needs to provide a more precise characterisation of the possible roles with this denomination and even provide an example of existing roles in institutions. Additionally, in some of the discussions the role of manager overlaps or is considered as a potential synonym for “professor”. There is sometimes the case, however, it would be good for the document to separate these two roles clearly and then let the contextualization process in an institution to address this situation.

When described the methodology used in Phase 2, there is no need to enumerate the partners of the project. The section should focus more on the method, which in this case is the sharing of the institutional experiences within the consortium. The same can be said to the tools considered. Instead, the process to integrate these elements into the phases should be explained in more detail as it is the relevant part of the methodology.

Section 5.3.3 could explain in more depth the methodology used to design this phase. The current explanation simply states that certain elements already published were “followed” but at this point the reader needs a more detailed description of those steps, the elements that were considered and the reasons to choose some of them.

The following comments apply to the section that starts on page 27 with incorrect number 5.3 that should be 5.4.

In the description of Phase 1, and as pointed out previously, the role of the manager and the academic may not need to be the same. Additionally, the role of the institutional leader can also be separated from the manager and the professor. It would be good to provide a

suggestion on the roles or responsibilities that are required for the role and then perhaps provide some examples of the names of these roles. A framework as generic as this one that seeks to maximise adoption could include a comprehensive set of roles to facilitate the mapping to a large number of institutional structures.

The description of the first phase (or activity) is done based on the requirement extraction guide that is included as part of Appendix A2.1. However, the figures included in that appendix are not legible. A higher quality version should be included in the document or the appropriate reference to a location in which they can be accessed.

The objective of the second phase in this manual is to identify hardware and software requirements as well as required data sources. This last element, the data sources, connects with an important aspect of the adoption of LA initiatives, data management. Perhaps the title of this activity could reflect this fact and include some explicit reference to data management.

The duration of Phase 2 in this dimension is stated as three days. This is understandable given the magnitude and detail of the elements that are considered. In order to promote adoption, it would be good to include a tentative division of this time into blocks or elements devoted to smaller tasks. This way potential users of the framework would have a better perception of the time requirements, but also of how the effort is distributed among its elements.

This elements in the “Guide of technical consideration for the development and implementation of the tool” are divided into four areas that are called “dimensions”. Given that a dimension is the term used for the first level of the structure for the overall framework, it would reduce the confusion if a different term is chosen. Additionally, the fourth element of this instrument refers to technical skills and knowledge required by technical personnel to support the tools. This assessment is perhaps more adequate to place in the hands of the managers and not in the developers. It all depends on the definition of “developer”, but typically decisions about personnel are in the remit of managers.

The current context in which tools are deployed institutionally may include conventional hardware equipment such as racks, servers, routers, etc, or alternatively the purchase of these services from cloud providers. The context and instruments considered in Phase 2 of this dimension could be adapted to include this wider scenario.

Section 5.4.3 mentions the terms “evaluation” and “testing”. Since this phase is directly referred as related to the development of tools, there should be a clarification is by testing the instrument refers to conventional software testing or not. The instrument considered for this phase is simply a check box. Given the potentially large variety of evaluation

activities, the instrument could suggest the creation of a description of some of these evaluations or the sketch of a plan for evaluation. The terms “testing”, “quality”, “evaluation” and “validity” need to be clarified so that users of the framework understand the purpose of tests, where do they connect with respect to evaluation, what is the connection with validity and how these measures contribute to the overall quality of the adoption.

The part of the instrument that addresses ethical considerations contains a single question. Given that there is a manual covering these aspects, it would be good to include more direct references to that manual in this instrument or clearly differentiate the angle in which this question is presented. Otherwise, adopters of this framework may perceive it as requesting the same information at various stages.

The actions needed to complete the “testing” stage of this phase is supposed to be done by the implementation team. However, there is quite a substantial number of tasks that range across a variety of stakeholders. The nature of the design could call for a shared responsibility for the deployment of this part of the manual.

In the discussion about the application of the guide, there is a reference to a “project”. The guide seems to assume that the actions derived from the guide are articulated as projects. This is a good insight that needs to be clarified for the users. The application process also considers need to answer the provided instruments in two contexts and then require a third one in case of discrepancy. This should be reflected in the table at describing the phase.

6 Ethical Dimension Manual (Section 6)

6.1 Main Elements of the Section

This dimension presents a set of phases to bring stakeholders in contact with privacy and ethical considerations emerging from the use of learning analytics and also to let these considerations inform the rest of the institutional adoption process. These are the two objectives declared in the manual. The design of this manual was approached through a review of the available literature discussion issues in this space. The final structure contains three activities. The first one is to gain a good perspective of how the area has evolved until now through a review of the literature and national and international regulations. This last element is very important to guarantee full compliance with the legislative context.

The second phase is articulated around a process of obtaining the expectations of two groups of stakeholders: students and professors (academics). The third activity consists on

reconciling these two views and identify a process to address the expectations and at the same time observing the legal and ethical requirements.

6.2 Suggestions

As opposed to the previous sections describing the previous two manuals, this section does not contain a section on the overview of the manual (except the first paragraph in the section). Given the relevance and the tight dependency between the elements in this dimension and the previous two, it would be very beneficial to the reader/adopter to describe these relationships explicitly at the start of the section. Additionally, this section could include more detailed information about these guidelines and provide an example of the structures within an institution that would need these guidelines to operate.

The methodology used for the section describes the three stages that led from an initial collection of literature about this topic to then identify the four articles used to design the manual. This clearly suggests some sort of formal review that could be included in the discussion. This is especially important to identify the criteria used to select the articles and more importantly to discard those that were not essential. In addition, and for the sake of completeness, the bibliographic information about these four resources should be included in this part of the discussion.

The description of Activity 1 in this dimension needs to be made more precise, especially in terms of the deliverable. Providing the four resources is a very good initial point but in order to prepare the interaction with the following activities the adopters could benefit perhaps from a categorization or division of interests among the elements proposed in the documents. Alternatively, the considerations discussed in the proposed literature could be mapped to institutional stakeholders or actors to start identifying who would be responsible for ensuring such considerations.

Along the same lines, this manual could also benefit from a more detailed description of the involved stakeholders. For example, when bringing into consideration the aspect of “access rights”, there is clearly a technical angle that needs to be considered by support personnel, but also a governance angle that must be addressed at the institutional leadership level. A discussion of potential stakeholder groups involved, or even considerations of which aspects are more relevant to which groups will help the reader/adopter.

When discussing the review of existing material, most of the emphasis is placed in the scientific literature. However, the legislation that applies in the context of the institution is perhaps one of the most important sources to identify those elements that are not negotiable (institutions must operate within the legal framework). The reader/adopter

could also benefit from an explanation why the “DELICATE” instrument is selected as the recommended one. The potential audience may take this suggesting as a shortcut to truly unpacking and understanding the current legislation.

The relationship between the activity described in Section 6.3.2 and those that took places on phases 2 and 3 of the institutional dimension (or Manual) is not clear. The reader may not understand if the interviews need to be conducted again or if the answers obtained from the previous activities are enough to proceed with this activity.

7 Community Dimension Manual (Section 7)

7.1 Main Elements of the Section

The fourth and final manual in the framework has toe objective of providing guidance for future adopters of the framework to become members of the LALA community. As opposed to the definition of objectives in the previous manuals that were more conceptual, in these ones the objectives are the steps required to join and contribute the community. Section 7.2 contains an interesting discussion of the rationale behind the creation of the community and certain initiatives that have already occurred in Latin America and are used to explain the context of the project. The introduction also includes an interesting description of the events currently articulating this community in the area. The phases or activities of this manual comprise two steps. The first one suggests the access to the information describing the project in which this deliverable is included. The second one guides the adopter through the registration process. There are two variants of this step, one for institutional members, and another for an individual researcher.

7.2 Suggestions

The nature of this manual is significantly different to the previous ones. For example, its position in the workflow (Figure 7 and similar) is a bit misleading as it appears as something that only make sense once the institution has gone or used the three previously proposed manuals. However, the participation in the community can be highly valuable if portrayed as a community of practice (Duguid, 2005) in which different institutions with different levels of involvement with the sector can exchange information and knowledge. It would be good for the project to articulate this community as a “Community of Practice” and consider it as a support structure for the adoption of the framework, not only as a manual to adopt once the other steps are completed.

A hypothetical separation of the structure from the rest of the manuals can inject a bit more flexibility in this section while preserving the objective of having institutions joining

the community. The description of the steps to join the community should be included as part of the documentation, but its division into the phases that have been used for the previous manuals seems a misfit that is not necessary. If this aspect of the framework is not formulated as a manual, it may contain a more precise articulation of the value proposition for the community as stated at the end of section 7.1.

There are some operational aspects of the community that could be described in this section such as the cost required to participate, and the two levels of memberships for institutions. Additionally, the description of the community could elaborate on potential initiatives that could be fostered. For example, one of the main hurdles that institutions face when deciding to embrace the use of learning analytics is that they are not aware of the possibilities, required structures, policies, etc. A very powerful action that this community could articulate is the exchange of this knowledge through a visitor exchange program. This type of program retains the value of exchanging information about the experience at an institution, but it provides a more focussed set of actions when the interaction is done through a prolonged amount of time. This possibility does not necessarily need to be articulated as a compromise or deliverable of the project, but as a possibility that may emerge through the interactions fostered in the community.

In this same line, the community proposes the right environment for institutions to simply explore the type of events or formats that are more adequate for their interaction. For example, the members of the community may identify at some point the need to share seminars or workshops about specific topics without the need to frame them in terms of sessions in already existing conferences. The structure and purpose of this community can be framed as to create the environment conducive to these conversations and potentially nurturing the appearance of these new initiatives.

If the community is portrayed as the element fostering the communication into adopters and institutions and researchers are encouraged to join not only at the end of the framework but instead from the very beginning, then it would be beneficial to include some ideas about how to make this community sustainable.

The information about its current composition is not that essential to be included in the framework. Instead, and having in mind the potential member, it would be more adequate to describe the value proposition of being a member and the possibilities of interacting with other stakeholders that have used the framework.

8 Preliminary Data Application LALA Framework (Section 8)

8.1 Main Elements of the Section

This section adds a strong component of credibility to the overall description of the framework. The activities and steps suggested through the previous manuals need to be consolidated through a solid body of evidence of their use and, more importantly, their institutional impact. The section includes relevant information about the events that have been organised as part of the project and its relationship with the phases. It is especially relevant the provision of numbers of attendees based on their institutional role.

Section 8.3 provides a detailed account of the preliminary results obtained applying the framework with respect to the adoption need and the ethical and privacy considerations.

8.2 Suggestions

The information provided in Section 8.1 about the data that has been collected so far provides a very valuable reference point for the reader. However, there are various magnitudes that are not specified and probably are number of attendees. Section 8.2 follows the structure adopted in other sections in which more complex data analysis was used and therefore granted the need for a specific place for it. The data presented in this section though has a more quantitative nature and therefore there is not a formal analysis per se. Still, the information included in the section is useful for a potential reader to understand the intricacies of deploying these instruments in the institutions.

The information in Section 8.3 could be repurposed to increase clarity. The elements of the result could be connected more directly with the elements of the framework. The two categories of results seem to point to Manuals 1 and 3 (Institutional Dimension and Ethics dimension) but this connection needs to be made more explicitly. Additionally, the reader could benefit greatly from the rationale behind the phases that were used. The information reported from these two categories is highly valuable and reflects the challenges of how to adopt LA related process. However, the description of the information that has been obtained can be expanded significantly (perhaps as another deliverable). Additionally, and given that the project now has the perspective of several institutions in Latin America, it would be good to expand this deliverable by adding common threads, connecting links, most common concerns, etc. In the same line, it would be good to include a summary of the results that goes beyond one line in the table structure.

Given the importance of contextualisation that has been described all throughout the document, the claim that the “one-size-fits-all” approach may not work appears trivial at

this point in the document. In fact, the results corroborate the need for all manuals and instruments to be properly contextualized. In addition, the conclusions of this preliminary data need to be expanded as to provide true value to potential readers and institutional stakeholders considering the adoption of the processes in this context. As previously mentioned, this section could be expanded with a simple account of the common topics emanating from the results, commonality on the strategies, the main obstacles and the challenges faced by the institutional leadership teams.

9 Dissemination Plan

9.1 Main Elements of the Plan

The dissemination plan is articulated around six objectives that range from basic levels of engagement through awareness, all the way to the creation of a strong community of institutions and practitioners that will remain active beyond the scope of the project. The consortium is aware of the need to achieve a “multiplier” effect through the dissemination and proposes certain initiatives to gather traction and promote the appearance of advocates beyond the consortium.

The dissemination is divided in to four levels or categories: internal within the project, throughout the community of practitioners to institutions with a vested interest in the adoption of learning analytics, to the scientific community, and finally to the general public. The report suggests that the dissemination activities will be active towards the end of 2019, although there are some ongoing initiatives that are already contributing the to the overall dissemination goal.

9.2 Suggestions

The four levels of dissemination are very useful for the reader to identify the strategy adopted by the consortium in this area. The consortium should consider using these levels as the element to articulate the structure of the dissemination plan. In other words, expand in each of these levels the type of initiatives that are planned.

The dissemination plan has a strategic relationship with framework mainly derived from its interactive nature. Most of the activities in the framework require interaction with subjects, discussions, interviews, etc. Perhaps the consortium could articulate more clearly some of the initiatives around the use of the framework. Regional or national workshops could be proposed to tackle specific elements of the deployment of the framework.

It is highly likely that the expertise already existing in the consortium is used to facilitate sessions within some of the institutional members of the community. This type of engagement is very important and, if present, should be reflected also as part of the plan.

The description of the type of activities and the current instances that either already happened or are scheduled could be separated to increase the clarity of the plan. In addition, it would be very useful to include in the document some more precise actions and smaller deliverables along the way in the plan. For example, the stages to create the community web site, or the stages to prepare, schedule, disseminate and deploy any of the workshops could be included as part of the plan.

The plan can also benefit from the inclusion of a set of indicators. In terms of engagement these can go beyond the number of delegates in an event, but perhaps other measurements such as requests for workshops, traffic through the web site, engagement with social media, etc. Another important indicator to consider given the nature of the project should include an estimate of the project impact. This aspect is more challenging to measure but the plan can propose some tentative measures such as conducting interviews to identify processes that have changed due to the interaction with the project, or initiatives that were motivated or prompted directly or indirectly through the project. In this context it would be beneficial to categorize the type of changes depending on the level of impact and the target audience: institutions within the project, students that are part of the institutions in the project, opportunistic adoption within the institutions in the consortium, institutions in the project that have reached a level considered as “systemic change”, opportunistic engagement outside the consortium, students in the institutions outside the consortium, and institutions outside the consortium that have reached “systemic change”. The definition of these levels does not imply that the project needs to deliver in each of them. However, it could be useful to differentiate impact for further analysis.

When discussing the impact through scientific publications, it would be advisable to include specific events and/or journals for potential dissemination together with their scope and impact factor. This list would provide the reader with an idea of the context in which these initiatives would take place.

An additional aspect to consider while deploying the dissemination actions is the interaction or influence in other projects. In the same way this project has been influenced by the SHEILA project (as presented in Section 4 of the LALA Framework document), this project could potentially have a similar effect in other initiatives in the space of learning analytics. The dissemination plan could mention this possibility and articulate the corresponding indicators of impact.

10 Conclusions

This document has presented an evaluation of two deliverables of the project LALA -- Building Capacity to Use Learning Analytics to Improve Higher Education: the LALA framework, and the dissemination plan. The project is situated in the area of learning analytics and seeks to improve the institutional uptake of the processes in this area to increase the overall quality of the learning experience.

The LALA framework has a structure specifically conceived to combine existing advances in the area of institutional adoption with a contextualisation of these contributions in Latin America. The articulation of the framework has been presented to take into account current challenges and limitations faced by institutions to first design a strategy, and then deliver based on that strategy.

The framework has been designed with a highly participatory structure and with a well-defined set of steps to foster the conversations that need to take place to influence the right roles to steer a successful adoption of learning analytics processes. The use of structures such as “manuals” and “activities” conveys an immediate sense of applicability to the framework.

The community defined around the project is the ideal context to maximise the impact of initiatives such as the framework. This community (of practice) can offer the right environment not only to those institutions that are already through the journey of adopting learning analytics processes but also to those that perceive its value but are simply considering the best way to approach this space.

The project has also an ambitious dissemination plan with a wide variety of initiatives and forms of communication. The impact measures or indicators need to reflect this richness and provide a wide variety of instruments from which to derive a more precise notion of the overall impact of the project. Ideally, the project should help institutions to undergo so-called “systemic changes”. Although these events have shown to be specially challenging in other geographical areas (Arnold et al., 2014; Colvin et al., 2016; Dawson, Jovanovic, Gašević, & Pardo, 2017), considering them as objectives helps to frame a more nuanced sense of the progress.

Both the framework and dissemination plan set the stage for a project that has a promising horizon with possibilities of having impact beyond the members of the consortium and with a community that can be sustained beyond the life of the project.

11 Appendix – Additional Comments

This section of the document contains more precise suggestions and comments to aspects of the text related with typos, rephrasing and minor structural adjustments.

11.1 General Comments

The following comments apply to the document in its entirety and should be performed across all the sections.

- The bibliography of the document needs a deep review. There are sections with numerous citations that are not reflected in the last section of the document. The bibliography of a document like this one is crucial for readers and other stakeholders to take full advantage of the work carried out as part of the project.
- Review the consistency of capital letters in all the section titles.
- It is highly recommended that before the last stage of the production process, the authors perform a comprehensive spelling check to detect minor errors.
- Given the length and complexity of the document, it is highly recommended to rely on automatic figure, table and section numbering and cross-referencing to guarantee consistency.

11.2 Specific Comments about the LALA Framework document

The following comments refer to specific locations in the document describing the LALA Framework where certain anomalies have been detected.

- Page 2: The table of contents in this page has two entries for the section with title “Conclusions” on pages 56 and 58.
- Page 7: Broken reference in last paragraph (likely to Figure 1)
- Page 9: “without including its validation” should be “excluding its validation”
- Page 10: “What are the needs and considerations that an institution should consider in order to adopt a tool for learning analytics?” Could be rewritten as “What are the institutional considerations to adopt a learning analytics tool or process?”
- Page 15: “To btain” should be “To obtain”
- Page 17: When describing the activity 4.4.2 the second instrument is described as “Informed consent: Ensures the voluntariness of the participants”. This could be describing the form as “Consent form to inform subjects of the conditions when participating in the study”.
- Page 18 At the end of the page “could not be used” should be “should not be used”.

- Page 21: “The LALA Template consists of a template” should be rephrased to avoid the duplication of the word template.
- Page 21: “change strategy resulting from this activity, will” should be “strategy resulting from this activity will”
- Page 21: The sentence “document the desired status of a higher education institution from the adoption of a tool based on the learning analytics” should be rewritten.
- Page 22: The image in Figure 3 is incorrect as it shows Manual 2 shaded. The figure is identical to the one used in Section 4 of the document.
- Page 23: “three different phases” should be “three phases”
- Page 23: Reference to Figure 3 is incorrect. It should be Figure 4.
- Page 27: “most tools perform tests to evaluate the usability and usefulness of the tools” should be rewritten.
- Page 27: Remove redundancy of “In addition” in first paragraph.
- Page 27: Section number 5.3 is duplicated. It should be 5.4
- Page 32: “What data does the tool to be implemented need?” should be “What data does the tool need to be implemented?”
- Page 33: Revise “if the guide shows that for the implementation of the tool it is necessary to acquire additional equipment for the tool to be implemented” to “If the results show that additional equipment is required to implement”
- Page 34: Revise “he himself” to make the document gender neutral.
- Page 37: “Google Academic” is likely to be “Google Scholar”.
- Page 38: The description of the instrument of the activity needs to be rephrased.
- Page 41: “analyses” should be “analyses”
- Page 41: review “*some examples of these instruments are included as examples*”
- Page 52: The second sub section heading is written in Spanish.
- Page 53: The first sentence of section 8.3 needs rephrasing.
- Page 60: Institutional Dimension: Appendix with LALA Canvas (available in the Drive)
- Page 68: “format to be applied to” should be “format to be used with”
- Page 76: Heading “A1.3” is duplicated. It should be A1.4
- Page 103, 108, 112: Review the inclusion of specific contact information within the institution.

11.3 Specific Comments about the LALA Dissemination Plan

The following comments refer to specific locations in the document describing the LALA Dissemination Plan where certain anomalies have been detected.

- Page 2: The title of section 1 is not in English.
- Page 8: “this institution” should be “these institutions”

Bibliography

- Arnold, K. E., Lynch, G., Huston, D., Wong, L., Jorn, L., & Olsen, C. W. (2014). *Building institutional capacities and competencies for systemic learning analytics initiatives*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Learning Analytics And Knowledge, Indianapolis, IN, USA.
- Colvin, C., Rogers, T., Wade, A., Dawson, S., Gašević, D., Buckingham Shum, S., . . . Fisher, J. (2016). Student retention and learning analytics: a snapshot of Australian practices and a framework for advancement. Caberra, ACT: Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.
- Dawson, S., Jovanovic, J., Gašević, D., & Pardo, A. (2017). From prediction to impact: Evaluation of a learning analytics retention program. In X. Ochoa & I. Molenaar (Eds.), *International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge* (pp. 474-478). Vancouver, BC, Canada: ACM Press.
- Duguid, P. (2005). "The art of knowing": Social and tacit dimensions of knowledge and the limits of the community of practice. *The information society*.