

EdTech Purchasers Comprehensive Journey Map



Overview of EdTech Selection Journey Map

EdTech products have been rapidly adopted by school districts but little is known about how districts choose edtech products. This research focused on uncovering the steps in the purchasing process to increase understanding around how decisions with significant consequences for students are made.

This resource focuses on identifying an exhaustive process of the steps a district may go through in identifying, evaluating and choosing edtech products. This is not meant to describe any particular district's process but instead increase understanding of the processes districts engage in.

Read this to:

- Understand the processes districts may engage in when choosing edtech products
- Learn about barriers and drivers to evidence ue in decision making.

SAMPLE & METHOD

200+ EdTech purchasers at the district level interviewed and surveyed.

01

02

Mapping of the steps in the edtech selection process. Behavioral analysis of the drivers and barriers to evidence use in edtech selection.

TIME TO READ 10 minutes

MAIN AUDIENCE EdTech



Reading guide: Evidence-exhaustive journey map

The journey map outlines **key touchpoints** and **substeps** of **decision-making** in the EdTech purchasing process, from recognizing a market or district signal, all the way to purchase and scaling. The map captures an exhaustive list of **all consulted sources of evidence** at a given substep.

A deep dive into the barriers and drivers per substep is conducted.

A key step that edtech purchaser would experience along the	S>		Needfind	An identified need or e parks the beginning a liscussion and investig district.	dtech interest I product ation in the	Evaluate	To better understand e products are scoped a distict needs, resource and connections are c	dtech solutions, according to es are reviewed, ionsuited.	> Pilot pi cr	niect edtech are broug loted in order to obtain ontextualized data on i eeting the desired goa	ht in to be ts efficacy in il.	P urchase	The editech that fu requirements and goal moves into pr implementation.	Ills the necessary meets the desired ocurement and
the district.		iteps	<u>الْمُ</u>	Q			5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	60	€		Ŕ	दिह 	1	
Substep		Sub-	Recognize market or district signal for new edtech product	Scope the gap between current products and identified needs	Conduct market research on available products	Identify products that meet basic technical and integration needs	Review products' fit and ability to deliver curriculum	Determine audience size for the product(s)	Access demo(s) or sample product(s)	Pilot the product(s) in the classroom and at home, as needed	Gather and assess feedback from users	Conduct final vetting of product(s)	Make the purchase for a product	Implement and scale the product
Specific decisions made or action taken by the purchaser that are associated with a given touchpoint.	IS	ces of Evidence	 Student data Peer districts Social media 	Current product engagement data Deacher feedback	Peer districts Social media STE standards Academic Iterature Tech listservs Conferences Vendor reports	Rubric BISTE standards State standards Tech & privacy standards Veer districts	Curriculum alignment Supplemental availability	Case studies Vendor websites	Vendor websites/vendor representative	Vendor websites/vendo r representative	C Teacher feedback Student feedback I Student formative assessments I Usage data	II In-house pilot data Rubric State standards and mandates	Vendor website/vendor representative	Vendor website/vendor representative Training resources
		Sour	"Everything starts wit "We have instruction administrators how t	h the learners' needs." Ial programs that teac o correctly use progra	h teachers and m effectively and	"The ISTE Standards "The evidence is use there that using it ea	have informed implem ad early on because th arly helps us narrow dow	entation practices." ere's so much out wn our options."	"We find a teacher, facilitate feedback, "We want to collect understand how are	per grade level who's v and collect data on b more formative assess ide levels change."	willing to try it, asic usage." ment data to	"The experience in- information." "Products are usele	house is the most imp	wtant piece of
Sources of evidence		-	their own data."							-		expect teachers to	use It."	
Evidence that is engaged at a substep touchpoint, denoted by c icon.	an	Drivers	Data-facilitated decision-making	District alignment on gap	Stakeholder diversity	Social norms	Communication across teams	Teacher engagement	Vendor openness	Availability to conduct pilots	Data-facilitated decision-making	Purchaser Empowerment	Deliberative thinking	Professional development
		Barriers	Misattribution of need signal	Limited ability to interpret/use data for scoping	Limited awareness & accessibility for product info	Choice overload	Ambiguous evaluation criteria	Lack of buy-in from end-users	Zero risk bias	Lack of time	Unstructured feedback collection	Sunk cost of piloting	Groupthink	Resistance to change

Touchpoint

Decision Points

Substep Elements

Barriers & drivers

Structural and psychological determinants that influence a particular substep.





Drivers	Data-facilitated decision-making	District alignment on gap	Stakeholder diversity	Social norms	Communication across teams	Teacher engagement	Vendor openness	Availability to conduct pilots	Data-facilitated decision-making	Purchaser Empowerment	Deliberative thinking	Professional development
Barriers	Misattribution of need signal	Limited ability to interpret/use data for scoping	Limited awareness & accessibility for product info	Choice overload	Ambiguous evaluation criteria	Lack of buy-in from end-users	Zero risk bias	Lack of time	Unstructured feedback collection	Sunk cost of piloting	Groupthink	Resistance to change





THE DECISION LAB

DRIVERS

BARRIERS

STAKEHOLDERS

Needfind	valuate	Pilot	Purchase
Identify potential products that meet basic technical and integration needs	Review products deliver cu	fit and ability to urriculum	Determine audience size for the product (i.e., a few classes, a whole grade level, a school)
Social norms of seeking peer district's review and experiences with products provides confidence in the products potential fit with the decision-maker's own district context, expedites product identification	Open and regular comm teams results in a more understanding of the dis instructional materials la compatibility and seaml	nunication across accurate strict's existing ndscape to ensure less integration	Teacher engagement for testing edtech increases the likelihood of the pilot being conducted to completion, contributing to more accurate and full feedback on edtech efficacy and ability to close gaps
"One of our biggest assets is that we meet with seven of the largest districts in North Carolina once per month to discuss edtech." "We take word of mouth on whether it works."	"The curricula team serves as o proposed edtech products; th aligns with curriculum."	a gatekeeper for any ney make sure it actually	"We usually pilot with a department or group of grade teachers, get their feedback, and then make decisions." "We discuss it as a team and pilot with teachers and also involve the principal and superintendent when it's tech decisions."
Choice overload from interacting with many products that perform similar functions can impact the preliminary cut of edtech products because the magnitude of options blurs the original gap or need to be addressed	Ambiguous evaluation deliberate assessment; formal rubric with estab the potential for alignm adopted product, esta quality, and district nee	criteria prevents further, the lack of a blished criteria reduces nent between the blished standards of eds	Lack of buy-in from end users makes it more challenging to gather the required feedback in later stages of edtech adoption, which is critical for final decision-making
"There are just so many products out there." "We also don't know what exists and sometimes, don't make the effort to find the research needed."	"There's no rubric - we want to rubrics now as we start to get "No formal rubric, probably sh	o develop more of those bigger." ould."	"Getting everybody on board is hard; if you can achieve 85-90% of people on board, you're doing a good job." Only 25% of respondents agreed that students are sufficiently engaged in the edtech selection process.
Technology/I.T. Director Technology team	Technology/I.T. Director S Curriculum instruction team E	Special education dept./team External consultants	Technology/I.T. Director Superintendents

DRIVERS

BARRIERS

STAKEHOLDERS

		Pilot	Purchase
Test products through demo(s) or sample(s)	Pilot the product(and at hom	(s) in the classroom le, as needed	Gather and assess feedback from users
Vendor openness to providing information about products, demos, and professional development are viewed as more valuable partners because they demonstrate an interest in the district's unique setting	Conducting pilots serve adoption because the in-house, highly contex effectiveness and fit of own district	es as a valuable step in e district is able to obtain stualized data on the f the product in their	Data-facilitated decision-making by engaging stakeholders facilitates the necessary buy-in for implementation through context-specific data
Relationship with vendor was the 2nd most popular choice for the most important information source on edtech quality.	"We don't buy anything un products to understand fea of concept." 84% of EdTech respondents should piloting an edtech p	less we use it; we pilot isibility and it serves as a proof agreed that their district roduct before purchasing.	77% of edtech respondents agreed that districts should consult externally provided information, data and/or evidence to inform edtech product selection.
Zero risk bias, which circulates around new or unestablished products, generates reluctance among districts to pilot it for purchase since it's a product by which there are no experiential reviews; this can result in districts inadvertently missing high-quality products	Lack of time results in and reduces the pote feedback on the long product	a rushed pilot process ential of collecting ger term efficacy of the	Unstructured feedback collection , such as anecdotal conversations, do not provide robust insights compared to systematic collections, which can inadvertently skew adoption toward certain stakeholder preferences
"We are not adopters if we are the first ones using it." Peer recommendations was cited as the 1st choice among survey respondents for most important information source on quality.	"Time is the biggest barrier to information on an edtech p Time was cited as the 2nd b information/evidence durin	o gathering relevant product." p iggest challenge to using g edtech adoption.	"Feedback from parents, teachers, and students; they're given surveys to provide feedback and there's no challenges." "If options are very few more focus groups are done with teachers and potentially students."
Technology/I.T. Director Teachers Technology team	Teachers Students		Technology/I.T. Director Teachers Technology Team Students

7

BARRIERS

DRIVERS

			Pilot		Purcl	nase
					RAR RAR	
Conduct final vetting of p	roducts	Make the pur	chase for a pro	duct	Implement and	scale the product
Purchaser empowerment , the fee confidence in one's interpretation products, supports the act of char product to be purchased and im that addresses the need or gap in	eling of n of edtech posing the plemented, n the district	Deliberative thinking formalized procedur purchase with confid terms, arriving at a b determination	that's scaffolde res helps districts dence and unde balanced and ob	d through make the r clear jective	Professional developm teachers and staff on capabilities of edtech scaling of all magnitud	the how-tos and the helps to facilitate des across a district
"We ask what students think of the produ autonomy and lets them know there's w opinion." "The product needs to work for the majo Everybody has their own opinion on how work."	rct; it gives them eight to their rity of people. r things should	"Faculty and staff get as the pilot by rating ease c the final decision."	ked for feedback usu of use, which then hel	ally with os us make	"We give the volunteer tead support for the implementa Teacher usability (e.g. profe 2nd in edtech feature priori	chers training and give them tion." sssional development) ranked tization.
Sunk costs concerns the high pro- piloted products end up being p because unless there are glaring the product, districts may still may with purchasing, even if the product best fit	bability that burchased j issues with we forward duct isn't the	Groupthink , the dest the terms of achiev conflict rather than addressing challeng impact the quality of	sire to make dec ring group harmo product's effica ges or needs, ca of adoption	sions under ny/avoid cy in n severely	Resistance to change strongly prefer familic reluctant to adopt a teaching due to subj switching costs, inhib teaching	e among teachers who ar products, and thus are new method of ective, personal iting the scaling of
"If we're going to pilot, we're already at a we're ready to make a purchase and loc piece" One in two edtech respondents agreed th usually leads to a purchase.	the point where king for final nat piloting	"I'm the final decision-mc then the Board has to ap accept what I recomme "If there's no major disage forward."	aker if it's under \$25,00 oprove it but they pra nd." reement on a produc	0. If more, ctically t, we move	"Teachers are used to doin new teachers are used to c use. It's hard moving from p to classroom use to student	g things a certain way, even certain technology for personal personal use to professional use 's."
Technology/I.T. Director Teachers Superintendents		Technology/I.T. Director Superintendents (of Business)	Chief Financial School board	Dfficer	Technology/I.T. Director Technology Team	Teachers Students

BARRIERS

DRIVERS