Just How Extreme is Adventure Learning?
An Analysis and Comparison of Adventure Learning Web sites

Justin Whiting
Indiana University, Bloomington
juswhiti@umail.iu.edu

Curtis J. Bonk
Indiana University, Bloomington
cjbonk@indiana.edu

Minkyoung Kim
Indiana University, Bloomington
kimmink@indiana.edu

Eulho Jung
Indiana University, Bloomington
euljung@indiana.edu

Xiaokai (Katie) Jia
Indiana University, Bloomington
xiaokaijia@gmail.com

Matthew Callison
Indiana University, Bloomington
mattcallison@gmail.com

Verily Tan
Indiana University, Bloomington
vstan@umail.iu.edu

Abstract

Extreme learning is an emerging area of research that is related to adventure learning and other types of nontraditional or informal learning. Extreme learning explores the way that people use technology in novel, unique, or unusual ways in a variety of settings As a first step in our research, over three hundred extreme learning Websites were identified as containing some aspect of extreme learning and an in-depth analysis of the content of these Websites was conducted. Each site was independently rated by four researchers, according to eight predetermined criteria. The resulting list of resources was categorized six areas: language learning, outdoor/adventure learning, social change/global learning, virtual education, learning portal, and shared online video. Among six categories, this paper will focus primarily on the adventure learning Web sites that were identified. Findings from

analysis of the adventure learning website will be discussed as they relate to the other categories.

Introduction

Despite all the promise of open education and open learning (Iiyoshi & Kumar, 2008), a lack or research exists about new learning formats and delivery mechanisms for open education. Questions arise about the tools and systems that might prove attractive to informal or nontraditional learners. Now more than ever, learning is not limited to a classroom and the opportunities to learn informally are all around us aided by the use of technology. It has been estimated that perhaps as much as 80 or 90 percent of learning takes place in nontraditional or informal settings (Cross, 2007).

In particular, areas such as outdoor learning, environmental learning, and adventure learning bring unique learning opportunities that were seldom possible before (Doering & Veletsianos, 2008). While there may be differences between outdoor learning, environmental learning and adventure learning, for the purposes of this paper, we have grouped them all into the same category and will refer to them as adventure learning. Adventure learning is defined as an approach for designing hybrid and learning environments that highlights the virtues of technology-rich, inquiry-based, real-world, experiential, and collaborative education (Doering, 2006, 2007; Veletsianos & Kleanthous, 2009).

As adventure learning is increasingly available and embraced, it is necessary to know more about the quality, use, scalability, and maintainability of these new resources. Issues arise related to accessing these contents and understanding how learners might use them to augment, enhance, or accelerate their learning. Just how are lives impacted? Are there empowerment moments that can be captured, demonstrated, explained, and perhaps replicated or extended? If informal and nontraditional learning routes found in adventure learning foster new forms of learning as well as increased internal desire and motivation to learn, there is a pressing need to know the reasons why.

Learning can now occur on a plane, on a mountain, in a jail, in a warzone, and many other areas with the aid of technology that might be considered extreme. For the purposes of this research, "Extreme Learning" is defined as learning on the Web in unusual or nontraditional ways with technology. Specifically, this includes learning with technology when in a park, plane, train, boat, car, or hospital. It also might occur when climbing a mountain, in a war zone, or taking a vacation on a remote island. Need more examples? Extreme learning with technology is often observed when involved in museum-based learning as well as learning with technology when at a summer camp, living in or visiting a research station (e.g., Antarctica), or when a student in an outdoor classroom. It can happen in a grocery store, zoo, cafe, bookstore, nursing home, hospital bed, or shopping mall. In addition to that, extreme learning can include learning when in virtual worlds, online communities or groups, webcam experiences and text messaging with experts in other countries, and using mobile devices to solve a problem when in a remote area. And, as evident in the media today, it can occur when learning a language online, when enrolled in a virtual school or university, or when using free and open educational resources and online courses.

At the same time, scant information exists about those using technology tools and resources to teach in unusual or nontraditional ways. Thousands of online educators are offering their services for free online to help others around the world learn languages, vocabulary, geography, mathematics, and many science-related disciplines. In addition, such instructors can

now find residence in a boat, car, dogsled, or café (Bonk, 2009). But why do individuals create content or offer their instructional services online for free or at some nominal cost? Bearing such issues in mind, one might ask whether there are particular instructional formats that are conducive to learning online; especially when outside traditional educational institutions or long-held standards related to effective instruction. Additional questions and concerns relate to how such online experts are accessed and how curriculum is created around different types of learning adventures.These are but a small glimpse of the many open research areas in this emerging field.

Review of Literature

Miller and Lu (2003) state that, "Overall the issue of on-line learning is perhaps the most important facing higher education as individual institutions and as an industry in the past 100 years" (p. 168). This change to more online courses brings with it myriad opportunities for nontraditional and adventure learning. Research indicates that, in general, students do not learn any worse, or any better, in an online format compared to traditional students (Simonson, Smaldino, Albright, & Zvacek, 2003); they may, in fact, learn more online (Means, Toyama, Murphy, Bakia, & Jones, 2010).

It shouldn't be surprising then that the online learning explosion is not limited to higher education. In fact, online learning is proliferating even faster at the K-12 level (Watson, Murin, Vashaw, Gemin, & Rapp and colleagues at Evergreen Education Group, 2010). As Internet access finds its way to most K-12 schools, it is becoming increasingly popular to bring adventure learning and other forms of nontraditional instruction directly to students (Doering, 2006). Nontraditional learning and adventure learning rely heavily on the Internet and the ability to connect to people around the world. Frequently, adventure leaning uses a hybrid approach to learning involving elements of a face-to-face (traditional) classroom and online learning (Doering, 2006). Instead of the traditional roles of instructor and learner, adventure learning uses both face-to-face and online learning environments where team members collaborate on issues in ways quite dissimilar from delivery mechanisms in traditional classrooms (Miller, Veletsianos & Doering, 2008).

There are mounting stories of Arctic adventurers on dog sleds using mobile technology to connect with classrooms around to world as part of an online curriculum (Miller, Veletsianos, & Doering, 2008). Projects like the Polar Husky, GoNorth!, and Earthducation bring students face-to-face with real life phenomena. As one example, Miller, Doering, and Scharber (2010) have designed a hybrid learning environment called "GeoThentic" wherein K-12 students explore real world geographic sites and resources and solve problems related to them with geospatial technologies. As a signal that this area has advanced, curriculum models and best practices are beginning to emerge related to the use of adventure learning in K-12 education and beyond (Doering & Veletsianos, 2008; Veletsianos & Kleanthous, 2009).

Such adventure learning and other seemingly 'extreme' examples of Web-based learning and teaching indicate that this is a burgeoning area (Bonk, 2009a). Everyone on this planet is impacted by new forms of free and open education (Bonk, 2009b). With an Internet connection, one can learn at any moment of the day and wherever they happen to be in the world. Their teachers, guides, tutors, and peers no longer are limited to those in their neighborhood or in the local school or university. In addition, in this new Web 2.0 world, learning content can be generated by anyone, not just traditional publishers, university professors, and state departments of education (Brown & Adler, 2008; Shirkey, 2010).

Suffice to say, much is contributed online that stretches the edges of learning to new geographic locations, learning partners, and content. However, as indicated, many issues and questions remain related to the designers and users of that content. In response, this particular study was designed to understand the technology tools, pedagogies, and learning potential of over 300 extreme learning Web resources. In the coming year, we will expand this pool of Web resources, and simultaneously, send out surveys to hundreds or thousands of participants, as well as interview dozens of those impacted by extreme learning Web resources.

Methodology and Data Sources

As with the study by Zhang, von Dran, Blake, and Pipithsuksunt (2000) more than a decade ago, one of the first identified goals of the research group was to conduct a content analysis of a variety of Web sites. Unlike Zhang et al., however, our study was perhaps the first to focus on "extreme learning." This content analysis included 305 Websites. Each of these was scored based by four individual raters following a set of criteria that was developed by the entire research team of more than twelve team members (Jung, Kim, Wang, & Bonk, 2011).

The first step in the process was to collect a variety of Web sites that might be considered extreme learning. More than a dozen individuals in the research team searched the Internet for additional resources using Google. They also explored Facebook sites, solicited expert recommendations, and scanned books, technical reports, blogs, and online news sites in an attempt to identify groups, individuals, or themes that might be researched with regards to extreme learning. The resulting list of resources was categorized into six areas: (1) outdoor/adventure learning: (2) online language learning; (3) societal change/global learning; (4) virtual education; (5) learning portals; and (6) shared online video. Of those, 51 Web sites were categorized as outdoor/adventure learning (see Appendix A).

The second step in the process was to develop a set of criteria to evaluate the Web sites. Four members from the research team were involved in providing an initial draft of criteria for evaluating the Web sites. The draft criteria and rating system underwent several rounds of revising and polishing with the entire research team. The final version of the criteria (see Appendix B) included eight areas: (1) content richness, (2) functionality of technology, (3) extent of technology integration, (4) novelty of technology, (5) uniqueness of learning environment, (6) potential for learning, (7) potential for life change, and (8) scalability of audience (Jung et al., 2011; see Appendix B). Using a 5-point Likert scale (1 is low, 5 is high), ratings were given to each Website based on the above criteria . To ensure inter-rater reliability, the rating process for all 305 Websites was carried on multiple phases where each rater would rate five Websites individually. At the end of the rating rounds, the raters created a list of all Websites in each category and produced an average score from all the scores of the eight focus areas or criteria.

Given the use of four raters, a statistical measure of internal consistency, namely, Cronbach's alpha, was performed to determine the internal consistency among them. The alpha coefficient for the four items is .744, suggesting that the items have acceptable internal consistency. This paper will focus primarily on the findings and implications of further research found in the area of adventure learning.

Results and Discussions

There are some interesting findings in the content analysis across the extreme learning sites, favoring adventure learning sites. For instance, adventure learning (3.01), virtual education

(3.15) and shared online video (3.25) categories all scored above the overall mean score of 2.96 across the 8-part rating system (see Table 1). The highest rated adventure learning component was the *Uniqueness of the learning environment* with a mean score of 3.7 out of 5. This was not altogether unexpected, due to wide ranging and often awe-inspiring locations that surround outdoor and adventure learning.

Table 1.
Average Website rating according to extreme learning criteria and category.

	Categories (Number of website)						
Criteria	Language Learning (63)	Outdoor / Adventure learning (51)	Social Change / Global (57)	Virtual Education (57)	Learning Portals (38)	Shared Online Video (39)	Average (Total 305)
1. Content Richness	2.9	2.9	2.5	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.05
2. Functionality of Technology	3.1	2.9	2.6	3.2	2.8	3.4	3.01
3. Extent of Technology Integration	2.9	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.7	3.2	2.86
4. Novelty of Technology	2.7	2.6	2.4	2.8	2.5	3.0	2.66
5. Uniqueness of Learning Environment / Learning	2.8	3.7	2.8	2.9	2.6	3.2	3.00
6. Potential for Learning	3.1	3.3	2.8	3.4	2.9	3.4	3.15
7. Potential for Life Change	2.6	3.1	2.9	3.1	2.5	3.1	2.90
8. Scalability of Audience	3.1	2.8	2.7	3.3	3.0	3.4	3.04
Average	2.89	3.01	2.68	3.15	2.76	3.25	2.96

Potential for learning and *Potential for Life Change* also was rated highly for the adventure learning (3.3 and 3.1, respectively). Such similarities indicate that adventure learning has a higher potential for learning and impacting the lives of people than other forms of extreme learning. The *Potential for Life Change* will be explored further as an area of research as the group seeks to interview individuals to find more details about the role that these extreme learning opportunities play in affecting life change.

The lowest category of the adventure learning group of Websites was the *Novelty of Technology* that was being used within these Web sites. It should also be noted that this was the lowest overall category among all of the criteria evaluated. One possible reason for this is that the reviewers of the sites could be considered expert users of technology, and may have an inherent bias towards new and unique technology, which might result in lower scores of the category as a whole. At the same time, there are many reasons that new and novel technology may not be used in adventure learning. For instance, often explorers are subject to budgets that may limit the currency, forms, and sophistication of the technology they use. They are simultaneously subject to the technological and access limitations of their potential audiences. At the same time, there are physical limitations such as the space available on their snow sled, boat, canoe, bike, backpack, or car.

An independent sample *t*-test at .05 level of significance was conducted by comparing the scorings of each category, grouping the sites into *Adventure Learning* and *Others*. Taking the average scores of the 51 adventure learning sites, and comparing them with the remaining 254 extreme learning sites, revealed some quite interesting findings. More specifically, the mean

scores of each category for adventure learning sites differed significantly from the other extreme learning sites on the following four of eight categories:

> 1) *Uniqueness of Learning Environment / Learning.* $t(303) = 8.09$, *p<.001*
> The mean of adventure learning sites (M=3.68, SD=0.68) is likely to be **higher** than for Others (M=2.86 , SD=0.65).
> 2) *Potential for Learning.* $t(303) = 2.11$, *p=.036*
> The mean of adventure learning sites (M=3.34, SD=0.64) is likely to be **higher** than for Others (M=3.11, SD=0.73).
> 3) *Potential for Life Change.* $t(303) = 3.26$, *p=.002*
> The mean of adventure learning sites (M=3.14, SD=0.53) is likely to be **higher** than for Others (M=2.86, SD=0.68).
> 4) *Scalability of Audience.* $t(303) = -2.32$, *p=.021*
> The mean of adventure learning sites (M=2.83, SD=0.59) is likely to be **lower** than for Others (M=3.08, SD=0.72).

It is important to note that findings relating to *scalability of audience* was significantly lower than overall score for the other five forms of extreme learning, was not altogether unexpected, but it does highlight one of the challenges facing adventure learning. Connecting schools, learners and learning experiences with explorers and researchers that are traveling or engaged in some type of outdoor adventure entails challenges of logistics, budgets, travel, effective communications, and finding or training qualified teachers that are interested in participating in adventure learning programs, just to name a few. Further research into expanding the scalability of adventure learning should be conducted to overcome this apparent shortcoming with adventure learning.

Conclusions and Implications for Future Research

Of the six main types of extreme learning we explored, adventure learning is an area that utilized technology and the Internet in highly novel and effective ways. Overall, the highest score for adventure learning was on the uniqueness of the learning environment/learning. Of course, adventure learning is intended to provide authentic learning environments that are quite different from traditional classroom experiences and expectations. This strength should continue to be a focal point for future research on adventure learning as greater understanding of the role and types of such authenticity in learning can have extended effects in traditional forms of education. The other criteria measured in this research project can also serve as benchmarks of the possible edges of human learning as curriculum pushes out to extremely novel environments that are socially, culturally, and ecologically interesting spaces for learning to occur.

While there are some valuable insights gained from the content analysis of the adventure learning Web sites evaluated in this study, further research is needed to determine how to best utilize these newly emerging and highly extreme forms of learning. Those creating or using extreme learning Web resources outside of adventure learning, such as in language learning, virtual learning, and social change, might be particularly interested in the distinctive features of successful adventure learning projects, tools, resources, and Websites. Future survey research of participants of these sites as well as follow-up interviews are needed and planed to better understand the strengths and challenges of adventure learning.

This research offers insights into what makes adventure learning effective; at least from the perspective of the Web resources that support it. Such information is vital as informal and nontraditional ways of learning online explode and become increasingly extreme. As this research unfolds and additional Web sites are evaluated and surveys and interviews are conducted, educators should begin to fathom the potential of extreme learning areas such as adventure learning.

References

Bonk, C. J. (2009a). The wide open learning world: Sea, land, and ice views. *Association for Learning Technology (ALT) Online Newsletter*, Issue 17. Retrieved July 21, 2011, from http://newsletter.alt.ac.uk/g57hhv01ses15pbvrjm4bf

Bonk, C. J. (2009b). *The world is open: How Web technology is revolutionizing education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bonk, C. J. (2012, February).Plenary talk: *Technology-enhanced teaching: From tinkering to tottering to totally extreme learning*. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Open and Distance Learning, Manila, the Philippines.

Brown, J. S., & Adler, R. P. (2008, January/February). Minds on fire: Open education, the long tail, and learning 2.0. *EDUCAUSE Review, 43*(1), 16-32. Retrieved on July 19, 2011, from http://www.educause.edu/EDUCAUSE+Review/EDUCAUSEReviewMagazineVolume43/MindsonFireOpenEducationtheLon/162420

Cross, J. (2007). *Informal learning: Rediscovering the natural pathways that inspire innovation and performance*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer/Wiley.

Doering, A. (2006). Adventure learning: Transformative hybrid online education. *Distance Education*, *27*(2) 197-215.

Doering, A., & Veletsianos, G. (2008). Hybrid online education: Identifying integration models using adventure learning. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *41*(1), 23-41.

Eppler, M. A., Carsen-Plentl, C, & Harju, B. L. (2000). Achievement goals, failure attributions, and academic performance in nontraditional and traditional college students. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 15*(3), 353-372.

Harju, B. L., & Eppler, M.A. (1997). Achievement motivation, flow and irrational beliefs in traditional and nontraditional college students. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *24,* 147-157.

Iiyoshi, T., & Kumar, M. S. V. (2008). *Opening up education: The collective advancement of education through open technology, open content, and open knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Free from http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?ttype=2&tid=11309

Jung, E., Kim, M., Wang, Y., & Bonk, C. J. (2011, October). *What technology tools promote such extreme learning?: Analysis of technologies used in extreme learning Websites*. Proceedings of the E-Learn Conference 2011—World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education in Honolulu, Hawaii (pp.

2581-2587), Chesapeake, VA: AACE. Retrieved March 19, 2012, from
http://www.editlib.org/p/39017

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2010). *Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies*. U. *S. Department of Education*. Retrieved July 19, 2011, from
http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf

Miller, C., Veletsianos, G., & Doering, A. (2008). Curriculum at forty below: A phenomenological inquiry of an educator/explorer's experience with adventure learning in the Arctic. *Distance Education*, *29*(3) 253-267.

Miller, M. T., & Lu, M. (2003). Serving non-traditional students in e-learning environments: building successful communities in the virtual campus. *Education Media International*, *40*(1/2), 163-169.

Shirky, C. (2010). *Cognitive surplus: Creativity and generosity in a connected age*. NY: Penguin Press.

Simonson, M., Smaldino, S., Albright, M., & Zvacek, S. (2003). *Teaching and learning at a distance: Foundations of distance education* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Veletsianos, G. & Klanthous, I. (2009). A review of adventure learning. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *10*(6), 84-105.

Watson, J., Murin, A., Vashaw, L., Gemin, B., & Rapp, C. and colleagues at Evergreen Education Group (2010, November). *Keeping pace with K-12 online learning: An annual review of policy and practice*. Retrieved July 19, 2011, from http://www.kpk12.com/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPaceK12_2010.pdf

Zhang, P., von Dran, G., Blake, P., & Pipithsuksunt, V. (2000). *A comparison of the most important Website features in different domains: An empirical study of user perceptions*. Proceedings of Americas Conference on Information Systems (AMCIS'2000), Long Beach, CA. August 10-13, 2000. pp. 1367-1372.

Appendix A.
List of Outdoor/Environmental/Adventure Learning Web Sites Evaluated for Extreme Learning Study

No	Web sites	Link
1	Abby Sunderland	http://www.abbysunderland.com/
2	ARMADA	http://www.armadaproject.org/
3	Cassandra Brooks' Website	http://www.cassandrabrooks.com/
4	Couch Surfing	http://www.couchsurfing.org/
5	Earth education*	http://lt.umn.edu/earthducation0/
6	Earthwatch Life from the Field	http://www.earthwatch.org/lff
7	EatBikeGrow	http://eatbikegrow.ning.com/
8	Emerging Explorer-Yu-Min Lin	http://albertyuminlin.com/
9	Eve Beglarian's River Project	http://evbvd.com/riverblog/about/
10	Exploratorium Ice Stories	http://icestories.exploratorium.edu/dispatches/index.php
11	Explore*	http://www.explore.org/
12	Explorers Web	http://www.explorersweb.com/
13	Geothentic Learning	http://lt.umn.edu/geothentic/
14	Go 4 the Summit	http://www.go4thesummit.com/
15	Immersion	http://www.immersionlearning.org/
16	Immersion learning	http://www.immersionlearning.org/
17	Impossible2Possible	http://impossible2possible.com/
18	Jessica Watson	http://www.jessicawatson.com.au/
19	Jon Bowermaster*	http://www.jonbowermaster.com/
20	Journey North	http://www.learner.org/jnorth/
21	Laura Dekker	http://www.lauradekker.nl/English/Home.html
22	Living & Learning Aboard the Good Ship Learnativity	http://learnativity.typepad.com/living_learning_aboard_th/
23	Mark Beaumont	http://www.markbeaumontonline.com/mbo/?cat=-0
24	Michael Perham	http://www.challengemike.com/welcome.htm
25	Minoru Saito	http://www.saito8.com/
26	Mountain World Productions	http://www.mountainworldproductions.com/
27	Nautilus Live*	http://www.nautiluslive.org/
28	NOOA Teacher at Sea	http://teacheratsea.noaa.gov/
29	Ocean Explorer	http://oceanexplorer.noaa.gov/welcome.html
30	One World Expeditions	http://www.oneworldjourneys.com/expeditions/
31	Penguin Science	http://www.penguinscience.com/index.php
32	Polar Husky	http://www.polarhusky.com/support/adventure-learning/
33	Polar Quest Ambassadors	http://www.polar-quest.com/
34	Polar Science Center (Wendy Ermold)	http://psc.apl.washington.edu/wordpress/

35	PolarTrec	http://www.polartrec.com/
36	Reach the world	http://www.reachtheworld.org/
37	Roadtrip nation	http://roadtripnation.com/
38	AL @ University of Idaho	https://alatui.wordpress.com/
39	JOIDES resolution	http://joidesresolution.org/
40	The Freshwater Switchyard of the Arctic Ocean	http://psc.apl.washington.edu/switchyard/overview.html
41	The JASON Project	http://www.jason.org/public/whatis/start.aspx
42	The Last Ocean	http://lastocean-project.org/
43	The mountain world	http://mountainworld.typepad.com/
44	Ocean Leadership Program	http://www.oceanleadership.org/education/
45	The world by road	http://www.theworldbyroad.com/
46	Quest Connect	http://www.questconnect.org/index.htm
47	Travel Blog	http://www.travelblog.org/
48	Wayne Hodgins	http://waynehodgins.typepad.com/about.html
49	Wilderness Classroom	http://www.wildernessclassroom.com/
50	Yacht pals	http://www.jonbowermaster.com/
51	Zac Sunderland	http://www.zacsunderland.com/

The site with '*' means it was selected as one of 25 'coolest websites' by the four raters.

Appendix B. Criteria for Evaluation of Extreme Learning Websites

No	Criteria	Definition	1 (Low)	2	3 (Medium)	4	5 (High)
1	**Content Richness**	This criterion deals with how much information the website, resource, or project contains on the topic chosen, how adequately it fulfills the purpose of learning, and whether the information is credible and up-to-date or not.	The website, resource, or project doesn't contain much information on the topic chosen, and doesn't adequately fulfill the purpose of learning. The information is not credible or is out-of-date. There are few resources providing access to learning content; it may appeal to different learning preferences or styles.	-	The website, resource, or project contains less information on the topic chosen, and fulfills the purpose of learning to some extent. The information is somewhat credible or is up-to-date. There are some resources providing access to learning content; it may appeal to different learning preferences or styles.	-	The website, resource, or project contains much information on the topic chosen, and adequately fulfills the purpose of learning. The information is credible and up-to-date. There are a wide range of resources providing access to learning content; it may appeal to different learning preferences or styles.
2	**Functionality of Technology**	This criterion deals with the ease of access, navigation, and use of the website, resource, or project and whether it contains effective and appropriately employed technology to serve the stated learning purpose.	The website, resource, or project is difficult to access, navigate, and use and contains ineffective technology for the stated learning purposes of potential users.	-	The website, resource, or project is relatively intuitive or easy to access, navigate, and use and contains somewhat effective and appropriately employed technology to serve the stated learning purposes of potential users.	-	The website, resource, or project is extremely intuitive and easy to access, navigate, and use and contains highly effective and appropriately employed technology to serve the stated learning purposes of potential users.
3	**Extent of Technology Integration**	This criterion deals with the range, amount, and types of technologies employed including issues of interaction, collaboration, and information collection, contribution, and community through such technology.	The website, resource, or project contains few technologies for learning. Technology tools are not interactive, collaborative, or participatory and do not promote communication or sense of community. User contribution is limited or nonexistent.	-	The website, resource, or project contains some range of technologies for learning. Technology tools are moderately interactive and collaborative and might enhance information exchange or user communication and contribution.	-	The website, resource, or project contains a wide range and amount of technologies for learning. Technology tools are highly interactive and collaborative and can greatly promote information collection and dissemination as well as user communication and contribution.
4	**Novelty of Technology (Coolness Factor #1)**	This criterion deals with whether the website, resource, or project contains emerging, unusual, or novel technologies.	There is no experimentation with emerging, unusual, or novel technologies for learning and the technologies which are used are out-of-date.	-	There is some experimentation with emerging, unusual, or novel technologies for learning which might motivate or engage potential users/learners.	-	There is extensive experimentation with emerging, unusual, or novel technologies for learning; some of which is quite exciting, motivating, or appealing for

5	**Uniqueness of Learning Environment / Learning (Coolness Factor #2)**	The website, resource, or project serves the purpose of learning in a non-traditional, unique, or extreme learning environment, which is highly different from traditional classroom settings.	The website, resource, or project is just a replication of formal or traditional school-based learning. The learning is essentially what the user or learner might experience in a traditional teaching or training situations. The website, resource, or project might be rather plain or unappealing to the potential learner or user; it is one of dozens of such sites.	-	The website, resource, or project is somewhat unique or different from traditional learning. There are learning opportunities that are somewhat novel or hard to find in formal or traditional settings. The website, resource, or project makes an attempt to connect people to each other as well as to novel resources and activities and current information not easily found in books or other traditional learning resources. There is also some room for creative expression of the users.	-	The website, resource, or project is unique or different. There are learning opportunities that are novel or hard to find in formal or traditional settings. The website, resource, or project connects people to each other as well as to novel resources and activities and current information is not easily found in books or other traditional learning resources. There is also extensive room for creative expression of the users.
6	**Potential for Learning**	This criterion deals with whether the website, resource, or project enables and provides learning activities or learning opportunities for the target audience to achieve the intended learning goals. There might be many markers, targets, or goals for such learning as well as celebration of those who have completed one or more learning-related units, activities, or segments. Such markers might come in the forms of self-tests, discussions, reviews, interactions, etc. or various rich	The website, resource, or project enables and provides few learning activities or opportunities for the target audience to achieve the intended learning goals. There are extremely limited markers, targets, or goals for such learning and limited acknowledgment related to those who have completed one or more learning-related units, activities, or segments (i.e., self-tests, discussions, reviews, interactions, etc. or various rich media resources). The paths for each learner	-	The website, resource, or project enables and provides some learning activities or learning opportunities for target audience to achieve some intended learning goals. There might be some markers, targets, or goals for such learning as well as celebration of those who have completed one or more learning-related units, activities, or segments (i.e., self-tests, discussions, reviews, interactions, etc. or various rich media resources). The paths for each learner may be somewhat unique.	-	The website, resource, or project enables and provides the potential for learning activities or learning opportunities for the target audience to achieve most or all of the intended learning goals. There might be markers, targets, or goals for such learning as well as celebration of those who have completed one or more learning-related units, activities, or segments (i.e., self-tests, discussions, reviews, interactions, etc. or various rich media

potential users/learners.

				-		-	
		media resources. The paths for learning are varied and extensive.	may be not unique. There may be few ways to socially network or collaborate with others at the website, resource, or project.		There may also be some ways to socially network or collaborate with others at the website, resource, or project.		resources). The paths for each learner may be highly unique. There may also be ways to socially network or collaborate with others at the website, resource, or project.
7	**Potential for Life Changing**	This criterion deals with whether the website, resource, or project influences or improves the quality of life and extends or changes the perspective of the world for the intended audience. As part of this, there is potential for individuals to experience life changing or empowerment moments from the use of the website, resource, or project.	The website, resource, or project does not offer much in the way of improving or influencing the quality of life or the perspective of the world for the intended audience. The impact is quite narrow or limited. Users might not gain anything beyond basic skills.	-	The website, resource, or project somewhat influences or improves the quality of life and the perspective of the world for intended audience. People are somewhat empowered to learn in ways that change their lives or broaden their outlook, perspectives, or knowledge and competencies. They can connect to other people or to knowledge and information in some ways that they might not have felt or experienced previously.	-	The website, resource, or project significantly influences or improves the quality of life and extends or changes the perspective of the world for the intended audience. People are empowered to learn in ways that change their lives or broaden their outlook, perspectives, or knowledge and competencies. They can connect to other people or to knowledge and information in many ways previously unseen or seldom experienced.
8	**Scalability of Audience**	This criterion deals with the potential impact of the website, resource, or project including the possibility to broaden the size and scope of its potential intended audience.	The website, resource, or project has a narrow focus or does not have wide appeal or potential impact. The intended or actual audience is quite limited.	-	The website, resource, or project has the potential to impact many people or a somewhat wide audience. It might have relevance to several different audiences or types of users.	-	The website, resource, or project has high possibility to impact a broad audience or large scale and scope from one or more educational sectors (e.g., K-12, higher education, corporate, government, non-profit, or informal).