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1. The brief

This is Deliverable 3.3 of Work Package 3. The Deliverable Title is:

Potential Success Factors

The Work Package Title is:

Analysis and Recommendations

It runs from month 6 (June 2011) until the end of the project (December 2012).

Deliverable 3.1 is summarised, rather cryptically, in the work plan as follows:

This Deliverable has P2 Sero as lead, with help from ATiT. The lead author person will be Paul Bacsich with assistance from Giles Pepler.

It will derive the input from WP2 outcomes, with the help of insights from Re.ViCa Critical Success Factors and any related information.

The more specific descriptions have to be dug out of the work plan for workpackage 3 which describes the Tasks that the various partners do. Task 3.1 is described there as:

3.1. Potential success factors – led by Sero, with ATiT, to be fed into WP4 at end of Year 1 - drawing on the exemplars documented - from virtual schools, e-mature schools, etc

The material below is extracted from the workpackage description of partner duties, with the descriptions reordered so as to be in order of partner number. Only two partners take part, Sero and ATiT. Thus the task management was straightforward.

1.1  Partner 1: Lambrakis

No effort.

1.2  Partner 2: Sero

Lead subtask 3.1: potential success factors.

1.3:  Partner 3: EFQUEL

No effort.

1.4  Partner 4: ATiT

Contribute to subtask 3.1: potential success factors.
1.5 Partner 5: MENON
No effort.

1.6 Partner 6: University of Leeds
No effort.

1.7 Partner 7: EITF
No effort.

1.8 Partner 8: Tensta
No effort.

1.9 Partner 9: Aarhus University
No effort.

1.10 Partner 10: TIEKE
No effort.
2. Potential success factors

2.1 Critical Success Factors

Given the interim nature of the WP2 work at this stage, we do not yet have enough information on failed virtual schools to carry out any deep analysis.

Thus our starting point for the list of potential success factors is the set of Re.ViCa Critical Success Factors reworded for schools. Below is the Re.ViCa list as adapted for use by the Distance Learning Benchmarking Club in terms of a virtual school within a conventional school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Criterion name</th>
<th>Criterion level 5 statement (reworded for schools)</th>
<th>Relevance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Usability</td>
<td>All systems usable, with internal evidence to back this up.</td>
<td>not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>e-Learning Strategy</td>
<td>Regularly updated Distance e-Learning Strategy, integrated with Learning and Teaching Strategy and all related strategies</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Decisions on Projects</td>
<td>Effective decision-making for e-learning projects across the whole school, including variations when justified.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>All staff trained in virtual school system use, appropriate to job type – and retrained when needed.</td>
<td>yes – but does it ever happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>A fit for purpose costing system is used in all departments for costs of schooling both face to face and virtual.</td>
<td>not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Planning Annually</td>
<td>Integrated annual planning process for the virtual school department integrated with overall school and course planning.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Technical Support to Staff</td>
<td>All staff engaged in the virtual school process have “nearby” fast-response technical support.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Decisions on Programmes</td>
<td>There is effective decision-making for new virtual school courses across the whole school</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Leadership in e-Learning</td>
<td>The capability of leaders to make decisions regarding virtual schooling is fully developed at departmental and school level.</td>
<td>hard to see what it means in a school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Criterion name</td>
<td>Criterion level 5 statement (reworded for schools)</td>
<td>Relevance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Management Style</td>
<td>The overall institutional management style is appropriate to manage its mix of educational and business activities</td>
<td>not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Relationship Management Upwards</td>
<td>The school has effective processes designed to achieve high formal and informal credibility with relevant government and public agencies overseeing it.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>The virtual school e-learning system is as reliable as the main systems students and staff are used to from their wider experience as students and citizens,</td>
<td>yes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td>Market research (to assess demand for virtual schooling) done centrally and in or on behalf of all departments, and aware of e-learning aspects; updated annually or prior to major programme planning.</td>
<td>yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>A virtual school system where security breaches are known not to occur yet which allows staff and students to carry out their authorised duties easily and efficiently.</td>
<td>yes – but boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Student Understanding of System</td>
<td>School pupils have good understanding of the rules governing assignment submission, feedback, plagiarism, costs, attendance, etc and always act on them.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Student Help Desk</td>
<td>Help Desk is deemed as best practice.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>Frequent (ideally annual) Pupil Satisfaction survey which explicitly addresses the main e-learning issues of relevance to pupils and their parents</td>
<td>not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 Key success factors

This will be looked at when WP4 starts.
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